

The 2 and the 10 Tribes of Israel

Jan Beute - <https://www.vlichthus.nl>

Jeremiah 31:31

Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah.

The New Covenant was to break in, but not in the first place for those to whom it was first proclaimed — the Jews (Judah) — but for the other part of the people of Israel. It was for the ten tribes, of whom most people think they have been definitively judged and have disappeared for good. Yet they most certainly exist. To them the gospel was preached, and they accepted it first. The Church of this dispensation even finds her origin in the ten tribes — such is the conclusion of Scripture. One does have to search for that conclusion, but then a clear connection between the ten tribes and the Church can readily be found in the Bible. It then also appears that the Jewish people are not the first heir to the title “Israel.” That title belongs either to all twelve tribes or to the ten, with Joseph at their head. This is entirely in keeping with the promises in the Bible and with the birthright that passed to Ephraim.

This publication confirms the thought that Bible study consists above all in reading very carefully so that the right connections can be made — especially where matters are concerned that have to do with the Mystery, the Church. The very familiar words of Paul about the unbelief and the faith of Israel therefore contain far more than appears at first sight. Who is that people that was not a people? Who exactly are the Gentiles? To whom does the original name “Israel” actually belong? The answers to these questions repeatedly lead us back to the ten tribes.

Genesis 12 - Pg. 3

The People of the Covenant

Genesis 15 - Pg. 4

Genesis 17 -Pg. 5

Ammi and Lo-ammi

Genesis 21 -Pg. 10

Ishmael and Isaac: types of the 2 and 10 tribes

Typology of Cain, Abel and Seth

Genesis 28 -Pg. 14

Genesis 48 - Pg. 16

The fulness of the nations — Two olive trees

Genesis 49 - Pg. 24

Deuteronomy 33 -Pg. 26

Jeremiah 31 - Pg. 27

1 Kings 11 - Pg. 34

Solomon

1 Kings 12 - Pg. 39

The name Joseph in Scripture

Hosea and Romans

Ezekiel 37 - Pg. 46

Ephesians 2

John 10 - Pg. 51

John 11 - Pg. 53

Hosea 14

Other Types - Pg. 56

The Lost Son

Two sons in the vineyard

The son of the nobleman

The good Samaritan

Introduction

Israel is certainly divided and the smaller part is known as the Jews, or the Jewish people, consisting of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. The large part, certainly in later times, is the part that can actually lay sole claim to the name "Israel." After Solomon the kingdom split in two. Judah separated itself from Israel, and the name "Israel" went with the northern kingdom, that is, the ten tribes. The Bible never speaks of the 2 and the 10 tribes, but of Judah and Israel, of Judah and Ephraim, or of Judah and Joseph. The ten-tribe kingdom was carried away into Assyrian captivity after a time and has never officially returned from there. Only a very small part went back to Canaan. That does not of course mean that the remaining part has never been delivered from that captivity. What remained was the kingdom of Judah. After the deportation of the ten tribes, that kingdom therefore laid claim to the title "Israel." And when we think of Israel, we think in the first place of the Jewish people. In the past, however, at the exodus from Egypt, it was not only the Jewish people that was brought out, but the whole people of Israel. Judah was only part of it.

When the Lord Jesus came, the gospel was proclaimed to the Jewish people, that is, to what was still left of Israel. They were also often addressed as "Ye men of Israel." The Jewish people, however, rejected the King who came from the house of Judah. The general thought is that salvation was sent to the Gentiles. In practice it has turned out that salvation did not so much come to the Gentiles in general, but — and this is a mystery — in particular to the ten tribes. So salvation was taken from the Jews, but nevertheless came to Israel. That in itself is not so important, for salvation has come to us on the ground of faith and not on the ground of descent. Salvation came to the ten tribes and therefore to Israel as a people, even though this is nowhere stated explicitly in the Bible. By "Israel" is therefore not meant "the Jewish people." It can form part of it. Where it says that Israel has fallen, it refers to the Jewish people, for Israel was open to the gospel.

The ten tribes were therefore carried away into Assyrian captivity. From there they moved as quickly as possible to the north. That had to be so, because they expanded enormously. That had already happened in Egypt. They were only 215 years in Egypt, of which 80 years in slavery, and in that time the people grew from 70 to more than 600,000 men. If that people multiplied on the same scale so rapidly in captivity, then it is clear why that period is spoken of as a great migration of peoples. Yet it was not that great nations moved; rather, great nations came into being. In those days, around 500 years before Christ, Europe was for the most part uninhabited. Of the peoples that arose from them, at least two large groups, and probably three, moved northwards and from there westwards. There was a group that travelled along the southern part of Europe westwards and then northwards. That is the group of peoples we know under

the name Celts. That group is again subdivided into various other peoples, such as the Gauls. Another group, known as the Scythians, travelled by the northern route westwards.

In the days of the New Testament, Europe was largely populated by the Celts, or the Gauls — it is exactly the same. They are also called, for example, Cimmerians. That applies to Spain, France and Germany, for the Germans were in fact also Celts. There is no longer any German living in Germany. Only the English, who are the true Germans, call Germany “Germany,” because they gave that name to the land where they themselves had lived. That is why in the rest of the world Germany is not called Germany. Spain is still called Iberia. That simply means “Hebrews.” And Ireland bears the same name: Hibernia. These peoples passed through those lands and finally ended up on the British Isles, but also along the coast of north-west Europe. The British Isles are called Britannia, and that name is also given to the north coast of France: Brittany. The names of the tribes have in general disappeared, although the name Dan can still be found. We come across that name all over England, but then it is written as “Dane.” Aberdeen is the name of Heber and Dan joined together. More particularly we find the name in Scandinavia and in Denmark. Scythians is the same as Scots or Jutes. These peoples moved on to western Europe in later times. From them the Angles and the Saxons are mainly known. They were therefore not Celts, but they also settled in England, where the Celts had already lived for centuries. Those peoples mingled with one another, because in the end they came from the same stock. Still later came the Normans, around the year 1000, when William the Conqueror became the first Norman king over England. Eventually the Normans also mingled with the population of Britannia. All these peoples, in their migrations through Europe, never mingled with any other people. In this way the gospel, straight after the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, was brought from Jerusalem to England. From there it was carried back eastwards, and especially to Rome.

The church in Rome, which was not founded by Paul but to which he so much wanted to go, proves to have been founded by the British royal house. Before Paul had even made one missionary journey, the gospel had already gone to Britannia. They probably already knew of the coming of the Messiah before the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus. Early church history soon came under the grip of the Roman Catholic Church, and she did everything possible to place the cradle of the church in Rome, while it is certain that the church in Rome was founded by the British royal house from the British Isles. In the Bible you find many references to the ten tribes of Israel, but it must be said that they are usually hidden references. For it concerns the hidden Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God did not become public through the two tribes, but hidden in the Church, that is, the ten tribes. Because in the Old Testament there are hardly any unambiguous statements about the Church of the New Testament, it stands to reason that the same applies to the ten tribes in relation to the Church. For if the Church is a mystery, one can hardly expect it to be told how that Church came into being. Yet you find it to a large extent in biblical typology.

Genesis 12

Genesis 12:1-4

1 Now the LORD had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee:

2 And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing:

3 And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.

4 So Abram departed, as the LORD had spoken unto him; and Lot went with him: and Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran.

That exodus from Mesopotamia is immediately the occasion for the promise that a people would descend from Abram. A people that would undoubtedly also be brought to a land that the LORD would show them. What happened to Abram here would later happen to the people of Israel.

Abram was carried away from Syria to a land that the LORD would show him. But all twelve tribes were later carried away to that same Syria, roughly to the same area. The promise is that the whole of Israel will be brought back from there and will yet be brought to the land. It does not say to which land. And for a very long time that is not said either. Only later is it added what that land is called. It at any rate leaves open the possibility that Israel is first brought to another land that is not named at all and could not be named. To a hidden place without a name, because no one had ever lived there, only to be brought afterwards (at the return of Christ) into the land of Canaan. The promised land runs from the Mediterranean Sea to the Euphrates. It is therefore in itself suspicious that a land is spoken of without it being mentioned which land it is. Later that does of course happen.

The People of the Covenant

A part of the Celts is designated by the name Britons. Berith is the Hebrew name for "covenant." So the Britons could be the people of the covenant. That great people in verse 2 ultimately refers to the New Covenant, to the thousand-year kingdom (the eternal kingdom of Christ). Abraham is the father of all believers, and only believers will enter the "thousand years," so that all who then populate the earth can be considered the great people promised to Abraham. That has nothing to do with natural descent, and that is not stated here either. It cannot apply only to the Jews, because the Jews do not form a great people at all. There are perhaps some 12 to 13 million Jews throughout the world. That is not a great people. If it moreover concerns the thousand years or the beginning of them, then that people is not great at all, for it must still go through the great tribulation. It is therefore not only about the Jews, but about the whole of Israel. The question is where those other ten tribes have gone. It stands to reason that the LORD has secretly brought them to a "land" and that they are waiting there for the return of Christ. Moreover, they have forgotten their own identity.

In verse 2 it says that the LORD would make Abraham a great nation. In the Hebrew it does not use the normal word for people "am," but "goy." This is the normal word to indicate the Gentiles: the nations that are not Israel. Or in other words, those called "lo-ammi" ("not my people"). It is therefore not about "ammi" ("my people"), but about the people that would descend from Abraham and that in general must be considered a Gentile people, namely as "not my people." If the majority of that people is formed by the ten tribes, this means that this people has for more than 2,500 years been designated as "goy" or "lo-ammi." Strictly speaking the Jewish people in our days is also counted among "goy" or "lo-ammi." So now that applies to all twelve tribes. It is therefore not specifically designated as a chosen people, but as a people that would come from Abraham. Of that Gentile people it says that it would become a great people.

Because the Jews always designate the Gentiles as “goy,” the ten tribes are also “goy” to the Jews. In this way one could even conclude that it is not even about the twelve tribes here, but only about the ten. It speaks of a privileged position among the other “goyim.”

Genesis 15

Genesis 15:4

4 And, behold, the word of the LORD came unto him, saying, This shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir.

Here it is stated explicitly that this people would come forth from Abraham’s own body. Not because he organises or gathers that people, but through descent. Eliezer, whom Abraham considered his son and heir, is thereby excluded.

Genesis 15:5-6

5 And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be.

6 And he believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness.

This same statement is later applied to the Church. But here it concerns Abraham and what would come forth from his body. That would be as the stars of heaven and innumerable. When it is applied to the Church and that Church is from the Gentiles, then she has a share in the blessings promised to Abraham only through faith and not through natural descent. The only way to get out of it is to say that the Church is a great people from Christ. And Christ comes from Abraham. And so we still come from Abraham. But the life we have received, by which we are one with Christ, is not the life of Abraham, but the life of the other Father of the Lord Jesus, namely of God Himself. So that reasoning is still wrong somewhere. Nevertheless, if you add these things together and then lay the New Testament beside them, where the same statements concern the Church, then from that alone you would have to conclude that the Church, for the most part, also descends naturally from the ten tribes.

Genesis 17

Genesis 17:1-8

1 And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the LORD appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect.

2 And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly.

3 And Abram fell on his face: and God talked with him, saying,

4 As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations.

5 Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee.

6 And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee.

7 And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.

8 And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a

stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.

Abraham was ninety-nine years old. One was still missing. We also meet 99 in the Bible as the ninety-nine sheep, for one is lost. The Shepherd leaves the ninety-nine and seeks the hundredth. He left the Jewish people and went to seek, to find and to save what was lost, namely the lost ten tribes of Israel. The “exceedingly multiply” naturally does not apply only to the Jews. In verse 4 it speaks of a multitude of nations. Not one “goy,” but a multitude of “goyim.” So it actually says that Abraham would become the father of a multitude of Gentile nations. That is repeated in verse 5. Abraham means: father of a multitude of nations. In Abraham is the word “am.” That is the normal designation for the people of God. But he would become father of a multitude of “goyim.” It speaks of Gentile nations, while in the name of Abraham is locked the fact that it concerns Israel. When both terms are used to designate the heirs of Abraham, it later becomes rather difficult to establish irrefutably that “am” stands for Israel and “goy” for Gentiles. The “exceedingly fruitful” is said twice in succession. That is typologically a reference to the double portion of the firstborn. It is always a reference to New Testament truth. “Making fruitful” comes from the word “para.” That is the term in the translation of “breaking” and “interrupting” or the well-known breach in the name “Perez.” That is always connected with our present dispensation. That breach, possibly to be understood as interruption, would bring forth much fruit. The interruption then refers to the interruption in the history of Israel and to the dispensation in which we live. Verse 6: From Abraham various nations would come forth, which would also be various kingdoms, with different royal houses. Outside the Bible people sometimes point out that the various royal houses that still exist would also rule over those peoples who really descend from the ten tribes of Israel. They all, without exception, have the lion in their coat of arms. A picture of the King of Israel: the Lion of David or of Judah. Verse 7: Here the New Covenant is spoken of. It is therefore not about the covenant with Abraham, but about a covenant that would be established on the ground of the covenant with Abraham. An eternal, imperishable covenant that would come on the ground of the promise to Abraham. When later in the Old Testament and also in the New Testament an everlasting covenant is spoken of, the Covenant of Peace, then that New Covenant is the fulfilment of the promises to Abraham. This means that this New Covenant must be directly connected with all twelve tribes of Israel and not only with the Jews. Moreover, that would be God’s people. When the Kingdom of God becomes public in the future, it must at any rate be a Kingdom consisting of at least the twelve tribes of Israel. So over many more nations than only the Jewish. Verse 8: Here it is again about the natural descendants of Abraham. And wherever the twelve tribes have gone, they will one day be brought to Canaan. The borders that Canaan now has are not the borders that that land will have in the future, for then it will be much larger. When the promises were made to Abraham, he himself was still “goy,” a Gentile. He was then still uncircumcised.

Romans 4:1-18

1 What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found?

2 For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God.

3 For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto

him for righteousness.

4 Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.

5 But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.

6 Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works,

7 Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.

8 Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.

9 Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness.

10 How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision.

11 And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also:

12 And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised.

13 For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.

14 For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect:

15 Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression.

16 Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all,

17 (As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,) before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were.

18 Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be.

The promises were therefore made to Abraham when he was still uncircumcised. The promises in Genesis 15 could possibly still apply to Ishmael, but in Genesis 17 those promises are repeated and there they explicitly concern the nations that would come forth from Sarah. From Ishmael also quite a number of nations arose, but the promises were not made to him.

Genesis 17:15-16

15 And God said unto Abraham, As for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be.

16 And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her: yea, I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of her.

Sarah means princess. This word can still be found in: caesar, tsar, sire, sir. God would bless her. From her several nations would come forth and several kingdoms.

Typologically Hagar and Ishmael are types of the two tribes (the Jewish people) and

Sarah and Isaac of the ten tribes. Sarah and Isaac are also regarded as types of the Church.

Galatians 4:21-31

21 Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?

22 For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman.

23 But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise.

24 Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar.

25 For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.

26 But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.

27 For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband.

28 Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.

29 But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now.

30 Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.

31 So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.

She who does not have the Husband will be more fruitful and have more heirs than she who has the Husband. The Jewish people has the Husband. According to the law she was married to the LORD. Nothing comes from that. It remains unfruitful. The other part, which came from Sarah, does not have the Husband at all and does not even know the Husband, because they are the Gentile nations. They can hardly have fellowship with the Husband whom they do not even know. We are speaking of the Celts, Scythians, Britons, Angles, Saxons, Normans, Jutes, Scots, Iberians, Germans. They do not know the Husband, yet they are more fruitful. That is certainly the case in our days, for the majority of believers come from these peoples, while only a minority come from the Jewish people. The promise is therefore also given to Sarah and inherited through Isaac. The word "goy" is always used, except in Genesis 17:16, for when it speaks of kings of the peoples the word "am" suddenly appears.

Genesis 17:14

14 And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant.

Here too the word "am" is used. So it appears that "am" stands in direct connection with circumcision. Anyone who is not circumcised must be cut off from "am," from the people, for an uncircumcised person is not considered "am" but "goy." The Jewish people, even in New Testament times, is considered circumcised. To Paul circumcision and Jew are even synonymous terms. When he speaks of the circumcision he means the Jewish people. The ten tribes prove not to be circumcised and are therefore "goy." From Sarah, on the ground of the promises, several nations and kingdoms would arise. This shows that it is not only about the Jewish people; not even about the biblical history of Israel as twelve tribes, for then you would have at most two kingdoms; not even about

the Church, for the Church is not kingdoms. These promises must have had a fulfilment somewhere after the close of biblical history but before the thousand years. For in the thousand years everything will be gathered together and placed under one King. Everything that has come from Isaac will then really have only one King. It may be that the other Gentiles still have other kings under them, but there is only one King over Israel. The greatest part of the time of the fulfilment of the promises naturally covers our dispensation, the dispensation of grace.

Ammi and Lo-ammi

It is not so much a matter of importance that it is called “am” or “ammi,” but more important is that on occasion it is called “goy.” Is the Church the people of God or not? Is she “ammi” or not? Everything that is a people and belongs to God can, from God’s point of view, be designated as “ammi.” On the “horizontal plane” it can very well be a Gentile people. Moreover, the Church is spoken of as a people that was not a people, but one can also say that this people is the Church. One can also say that it is not a people, because it is officially “lo-ammi,” for it does not come from Israel. Both terms are applied side by side to the same thing.

A certain term is not always applied to only one thing. We always learn, for example, that the title Christ refers to the One who has risen from the dead and sits at the right hand of God, yet the Bible nevertheless speaks of the crucifixion of Christ. We are then inclined to say that it must be Jesus, because He was crucified. That is also true. But it is written that way to make the connection with the fact that Jesus was indeed crucified, but thereby became the Christ, and so there is still mention of the cross of Christ. For He only became Christ through the cross. Further, it speaks of Jesus who sits at the right hand of God. While we again say that Jesus must sit on the throne of David in Jerusalem and that Christ belongs at the right hand of God. That would then be the correct terminology. But Jesus, the son of David, was taken from among men by God and set with God to do the things that are to be done there.

The Bible uses both terms to designate the Church: “ammi” and “lo-ammi.” The same applies to Israel. Israel is seen as “ammi,” as the people of God, the chosen people, the apple of God’s eye. Without further explanation you can do nothing with those statements, for Israel only becomes God’s people when it comes to faith. Nevertheless, at the time when it has not come to faith, it is still God’s chosen people, but not God’s people and is therefore “lo-ammi” and will only be “ammi” in the future. It is nevertheless the people with whom God has a plan, over whom He has pronounced a blessing, and of whom He has even said that it will always, from the beginning of history right to the end, be blessed. And will therefore always be “ammi.” If the Church comes from the ten tribes and is also regarded as fruit from the ten tribes, then she is “ammi” and “ruchama,” God’s people and beloved, while by nature she is precisely “lo-ammi” and “lo-ruchama.” So both terms apply to her.

God has not had mercy on the ten tribes of Israel. God has only sent the gospel to the ten tribes, just as He also did to the two tribes. He has mercy on believers. He loves believers and makes them His people. Namely one people, for His Name, with a heavenly calling and a heavenly inheritance. Is it then “ammi” or “lo-ammi”? It can be both. It just depends on which side you look at it from. You therefore cannot make a concordant Bible translation, for one and the same word never has one and the same meaning.

Genesis 17:17

17 Then Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed, and said in his heart, Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear?

Abraham laughed, yet he still believed God. He thought it a good joke, because what could not actually happen nevertheless happened. But that the gospel was brought to Israel, which rejects it, after which it then goes to the Gentiles, can actually not happen either. In this way the Church is built, after which the gospel goes again to Israel. The beauty is precisely that, while no one knows it, while it is nowhere stated completely concretely and unambiguously in the Bible, the gospel comes where it has to come (for that was fixed in the promises), namely to Israel and then to the Gentiles. So to the whole of Israel, the twelve tribes, to the Gentiles, the other Gentiles. It proves that, although it is nowhere stated explicitly in the Bible, it has nevertheless happened that way. No one could have forced that, and it is still a wonderful story. Unexpectedly, even unimportant to us, God keeps His Word.

All those statements in the Bible in which God says: "I make My promise and I do not break it; I keep My Word," are promises that prove to be fulfilled even more strongly than we ever thought. For even in our days there exists a direct relationship between the Lord and Israel, although Israel is officially regarded as "lo-ammi." That relationship is maintained through the calling of the Church. While one part of Israel came under the curse, the other part expressly received the blessings. But that is of course a well-known biblical principle.

Genesis 17:19

19 And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him.

In Genesis 17 Isaac is introduced. The name "Isaac" can still be found in the "Saxons." The only explanation for the name "Saxons," the Saxon people, is that that name means: sons of Isaac. In older writings "Saxon" is often written with an "I" in front: "Isaxon." This simply means: the sons of Isaac.

In Germany you also find that name, although in that country there are generally no Saxons living at all. But the name has remained attached to the land and then other peoples who later settled there have taken their name from that name and have called themselves Saxons, because they lived in Saxony. That land was called Saxony because the Saxons used to live there. But if someone claims that he is a Saxon, he cannot prove it, because he has no family register after all.

Genesis 17:20

20 And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation.

That confirms that Ishmael is a type of natural Israel in general and of the two tribes in particular. Ishmael and Isaac stand here in contrast to each other, just as the two tribes stand in contrast to the ten tribes. So the promises made to Isaac are in fact promises to the ten tribes, and the promises to Ishmael are to the two tribes. When the promises to the ten tribes are fulfilled, the Church comes into being, for one must recognise that the promises made to Isaac are applied in the New Testament to the Church. From this the

conclusion follows that the Church is primarily formed from the ten tribes of Israel. From Isaac and not from Ishmael.

Genesis 17:21-22

21 But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year.

22 And he left off talking with him, and God went up from Abraham.

Ishmael would be fruitful, but with Isaac He would establish an everlasting covenant.

Genesis 21

In Genesis 21 we read what happened after the birth of Isaac, the son whom Sarah bore to Abraham in his old age, at the set time that God had spoken to him. “In his old age” can in any case be synonymous with “the last days.” That means after the first coming of Christ. That has now lasted some 2,000 years.

Genesis 21:2

2 For Sarah conceived, and bare Abraham a son in his old age, at the set time of which God had spoken to him.

“The set time” reminds us of “the appointed time,” “the time appointed by the Father” in Galatians 4. “The set time” is, in my view, at any rate the time of the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. There the old age begins, namely “the last days.” A little further on in Galatians 4, and in exactly the same argument, Paul sets Hagar and Sarah, and thus Ishmael and Isaac, and thus Sinai and Zion, over against each other. He therefore also sets the two tribes and the ten tribes over against each other. Over against the Jews stands the Church. The Jewish people and the two tribes are now one and the same, so that the Church and the ten tribes also lie remarkably close to each other. They are not the same, for there is a difference, but nevertheless they lie side by side.

Genesis 21:3-5

3 And Abraham called the name of his son that was born unto him, whom Sarah bare to him, Isaac.

4 And Abraham circumcised his son Isaac being eight days old, as God had commanded him.

5 And Abraham was an hundred years old, when his son Isaac was born unto him.

Isaac means “laughter,” namely the joy of the New Covenant. Abraham was a hundred years old, and at a hundred one enters the Kingdom. A hundred speaks of faith and thereby of entering the Kingdom and thereby of the breaking in of the New Covenant. The breaking in of the New Covenant took place at the resurrection of Christ. And there the blessings are fulfilled — if all is well — to Israel. We then learn that Israel has stumbled and that those blessings have therefore gone to the Church. But the point is that this actually cannot be. The New Covenant breaks in and then it does happen. Not on a higher application, although that is so, but also in the literal application. Namely to Israel, and indeed to those who have more right to the name Israel than the Jewish people. At a hundred years one enters the Kingdom, or the Tabernacle. That is entering through the eye of the needle. At a hundred years the Son is born.

Genesis 21:6

6 And Sarah said, God hath made me to laugh, so that all that hear will laugh with me.

She laughed, of course, with joy and gladness. The joy of the New Covenant. We do the same, especially when we know the deeper background of these statements.

Genesis 21:8-10

8 And the child grew, and was weaned: and Abraham made a great feast the same day that Isaac was weaned.

9 And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking.

10 Wherefore she said unto Abraham, Cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac.

Ishmael and Isaac: types of the 2 and 10 tribes

That is also what happens. If we hold to the typology for a moment: Ishmael is the picture of the two tribes, the people in slavery. Ishmael was after all the slave, the slave of the law. And Ishmael would not inherit with the free son. That is exactly what happened to the Jewish people. Ishmael was the firstborn, but Isaac, who is a type of the ten tribes, received the birthright. The Church has also received that birthright, and therefore one must conclude that this happens on the ground of descent from the ten tribes. This thought is quoted in Galatians 4. The set time in verse 2, of the breaking in of the New Covenant, in which slavery ceases (that is really stated there) and the Son appears, is in verses 30 and 31 directly applied to Ishmael and Isaac. The slave is cast out and the son of the free woman inherits. The Jewish people was in slavery under the law, but the ten tribes were as free as a bird. They disappeared into Assyrian captivity, but spread out over the earth and were then free. Free from the Old Covenant, free from the law. They no longer knew the Lord and could do what they wanted. The remarkable thing is that where man is free from fixed traditions, from religious slavery, he is most easily reached with the gospel. For it is an enormously difficult work to bring someone who is in slavery into the liberty and glory of the children of God.

God has given the ten tribes freedom in the hope that from that freedom, unblinded by the law (for they did not live under it), they would yet come to the acceptance of that same Lord, but then only after He had risen from the dead. Hence Scripture speaks of the bill of divorcement with which the Lord has sent away the ten tribes of Israel. The two tribes were married to the Lord until the death of the LORD. The Jewish people therefore became a widow. The ten tribes were sent away by divorce. But both with the purpose that with the freedom obtained they would bind themselves to the One who has risen from the dead (Romans 7). Those who were under the law in general did not come to the Lord, but those who were not under the law in general did. So the son of the bondwoman shall not inherit with Isaac. That stands both in Genesis 21 and in Galatians 4.

Genesis 21:11-12

11 And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son.

12 And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called.

That is a formulation that we do not use in English in that way: "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." If we say it in plain English it reads: "Thy seed shall be called Isaac." When was that seed of Abraham literally called Isaac? As soon as we say that the ten tribes are found again in the Anglo-Saxon peoples, in which the Angles form a minority, we are

therefore saying that we find them in Isaac. That they are found under the name Isaac, namely under the name Saxons. The Celtic and Scythian peoples have all merged into the Anglo-Saxon peoples. That term has simply remained. Where, without typology or spiritual things, do you find Christianity or where do you find the Church on the map? There where the Saxon peoples live.

Typology of Cain, Abel and Seth

The typology of the offering of Cain over against the offering of Abel, which ascends to the Lord, is as follows. Cain is a picture of Israel, which after all rejected the Lord Jesus. Abel is a type of the Lord Jesus. From what is written about Cain throughout the Bible it appears that Cain is a picture of Israel, but more particularly of the Jewish people. The blood of Abel will be required at the hand of Israel. Cain would also be a fugitive and a vagabond over the whole earth, as if his name were Ahasuerus: the wandering Jew; but no one would be able to kill him. That was the sign. The characteristic of Cain was that everyone wanted to kill him, but that never succeeded. That is also the characteristic of the Jewish people. While Cain really should have been killed as a murderer, he remained alive, but as a wanderer. If Cain is a picture of the two tribes, then Abel is a picture of the ten tribes. Abel is of course in the first place a type of the Lord Jesus, but also of the ten tribes, who are better known under the name Israel, or under the name Joseph. Abel, whose name means “vanity” or “emptiness,” can very well also be a type of the ten tribes. They do not have the law at all and are therefore empty, actually dead. What Cain did in the name of the two tribes was to kill the Son of Joseph. That is typology. Abel is then replaced by a third figure, Seth. That means: substitute. Of him it is said that he is the seed. Another seed, but the seed. So behind the scheme of these three names, Cain, Abel and Seth, we recognise the two tribes, the ten tribes and the Church. For Seth is a picture of the Church. He came in the place of Abel, who was gone. And in Abel the seed is seen.

“In Isaac shall thy seed be called.” We also meet this statement in Romans 9:7 and in Hebrews 11:18.

Genesis 17:20

20 And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation.

That confirms that Ishmael is a type of natural Israel in general and of the two tribes in particular. Ishmael and Isaac stand here in contrast to each other, just as the two tribes stand in contrast to the ten tribes. So the promises made to Isaac are in fact promises to the ten tribes, and the promises to Ishmael are to the two tribes. When the promises to the ten tribes are fulfilled, the Church comes into being, for one must recognise that the promises made to Isaac are applied in the New Testament to the Church. From this the conclusion follows that the Church is primarily formed from the ten tribes of Israel. From Isaac and not from Ishmael.

Hebrews 11:17-19

17 By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son,

18 Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called:

19 Accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure.

Isaac, so to speak, returned from the dead. The remarkable thing is that Isaac was not actually killed, although that could easily have happened. For Abraham reasoned that God was able to raise Isaac from the dead. Nevertheless, Isaac did not die. He was bound, and in a manner of speaking he was dead; and so, in a manner of speaking, Abraham received him back from the dead. But how could that be? For sacrificial animals are usually killed first and then placed on the altar. What happens on the altar is not a picture of death, but of resurrection from the dead. The animals are first slain, then laid on the altar, and—if all is well—they ascend from there to God. An offering speaks of how one approaches God, not of how one dies, for that precedes it. Isaac was only bound. He was not only a type of the Lord Jesus, but also a type of the ten tribes of Israel who are in captivity. Those ten tribes are, so to speak, dead. In any case they are imprisoned, in captivity—for that is the same thing. Actually Isaac should have died on the altar, but he was only bound and was thus offered and brought to God, and from there he returned alive to Abraham. Exactly as he had told his servants. Before the ten tribes literally appear again, it is evident that they were bound on the altar, in captivity, scattered, but nevertheless on the altar. And therefore in that way connected with the living God.

Our life is devoted to Him, and He does His work with it. Hence the seemingly unimportant remark in Genesis 21 (“for in Isaac shall thy seed be called”) is repeated twice in the New Testament. Both passages stand in direct connection with the Church. Hebrews 11 indeed mentions a whole series of heroes of faith—and they were that—but the interesting thing is that all those examples also typologically point to the calling of the Church in our day. It is therefore not for nothing that Abel is mentioned there. But it is an interpretation that is generally not known. And where it speaks of Abraham offering Isaac, that is a picture of how the Church comes into being. From Isaac, or from the Saxons, while in reality they are bound or in captivity. They are bound on an altar and from that altar they rise, or rather they are born again.

Genesis 13:18

18 Then Abram removed his tent, and came and dwelt in the plain of Mamre, which is in Hebron, and built there an altar unto the LORD.

The Celts lived under the oak tree. They were governed from the oak tree, the sacred tree. Under it they held their councils.

Genesis 28

Isaac seemed to be about to die, although he did not die for a long time, but they nevertheless thought it was time for Isaac to settle the inheritance. You know how it went: Esau was by nature the firstborn and should have received the birthright blessing. That blessing came to Jacob. Isaac blessed Jacob by faith. Esau then became so terribly jealous of Jacob that Jacob had to flee. But when it is a matter of the inheritance that must be given, then it is a matter of the application of the testament at the death of the testator and thus of the breaking in of the New Covenant. Isaac appears to die and he passes his possessions to the next generation. That is a picture of how the New Covenant would break in. Instead of the birthright and thus the salvation (= the fulfilment of the promises) coming to Esau, it goes to Jacob. Esau becomes jealous and terribly angry. The Jewish people would also be provoked to jealousy. Esau is a picture of that. He was by nature the firstborn, was family of the King, the Jew par excellence, but

nevertheless the salvation comes to the brother. So Jacob must be a type of the Church. Certainly in this relationship.

Jacob does not simply flee abroad, but to Syria. To Paddan-aram. That is where Abraham originally came from. So he goes back to the beginning. More particularly he goes there to the other branch of the family. To the older branch. The family of Abraham's brother. The line of Nahor, Bethuel and Laban. That is also where his mother Rebekah came from. Jacob therefore goes—with nothing at all—to his uncle Laban. He had just obtained the birthright with the accompanying blessing, but in practice he received nothing at all. Isaac's possessions therefore did not come to Jacob at all, but to Esau. After which, moreover, twenty years later, Jacob returned from uncle Laban, met Esau, and they compared their possessions. Esau then said to Jacob: "Brother, the Lord has given me much"; whereupon Jacob said: "Brother, the Lord has given me everything." Esau had built up his possessions from those of Isaac. After all, he had simply stayed at home and had never been away (just like in the parable of the prodigal son). But all Jacob's possessions—all his blessings—were not from Isaac, but from Laban. And therefore from Bethuel and therefore from Nahor and therefore from the brother of Abraham, the other line of the family. Just as Isaac's wife, the mother of Jacob, also came from the other branch of the family. She was the daughter of Bethuel. Jacob's wives came from the same line of the family. A principle you can never get around. It always happens that way. In addition, the whole history of the patriarchs stands as a model for our dispensation. That means that there are indeed promises, but the final fulfilment lies in the future.

Abraham in any case married his sister, of the same father but of another mother. Isaac also married, in a broader sense, his sister, although she was his cousin, and with Jacob exactly the same thing happens. Jacob arrived at Laban with nothing and had to work there. In any case he received two wives there and two more wives and eleven sons. And in a terribly ingenious way he also acquired a whole collection of livestock. So all Jacob's wealth came from Laban. It is even said that Laban became impoverished. For at the time of the taking up of the Church Jacob suddenly departs. He had suddenly left, secretly. And Laban remains impoverished behind. Afterwards they still meet for a moment, for Laban pursued him. They then made a covenant and set up a heap of stones, a custom that the Celts later also practised everywhere. The point is that Jacob receives all his possessions from Laban, from the branch you would least expect. While Jacob is on his way to Laban, he leaves Beersheba, a place that stands as a model for the promises that were made. He arrives at a place where he spends the night and the sun had gone down. Then he makes a stone his pillow (headrest), a menhir I always think, but that was only later when he set it up, and he dreamed. As soon as dreaming occurs in the Bible it is about truths in connection with the hidden Kingdom. The Lord appears to him in a dream. And because it is in a dream and outside normal physical reality it is about Church truth, things in connection with the mysteries of the Kingdom. He sees a heap of stones (translated as ladder) that was set up on the earth and whose top reached to heaven. That is the pyramid whose top is missing. That is the well-known pyramid from Ephesians 2, of which the chief corner stone is Christ. If you neatly arrange a heap of stones—with an eye to typology—you get that model. The angels of God were ascending and descending on it. And the LORD stood above that ladder. He was actually standing on the pyramid. The Lord also stood on Horeb, for He came with water out of the rock, and in Ephesians 2 the Lord stands on the top of the building, the

pyramid. That expresses Church truth. The Lord therefore also stood on the ladder and said: "I am the LORD, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed."

Genesis 28:4

4 And give thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee, and to thy seed with thee; that thou mayest inherit the land wherein thou art a stranger, which God gave unto Abraham.

It could just as well have been the blessing of Nahor, for in practice it was that. The salvation is indeed of the Jews, but in practice we note that it does not come from the Jews, but from Joseph. Not from the two tribes, but from the ten tribes. The spiritual things come to us through Judah, namely through the Lord Jesus Christ, and He is of Judah. But reckoned according to the earthly side it does not come from Judah, but from the older branch of the family, namely Joseph. And that is so here too. The twelve tribes of Israel can just as well be considered as descendants of Nahor, Bethuel and Laban.

Genesis 28:14

14 And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed.

One may safely say to all the corners of the earth. Not only in Canaan, but over the whole earth. One can easily imagine a multitude of nations in that. And as has been said, the Anglo-Saxon peoples have indeed settled in the west of Europe, but from there they have spread over the whole earth. In large numbers they went to Canada, North America, South America, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand. Applied to the Jewish people or to the history of the twelve tribes, within the limitation of the Old Testament, that is strongly exaggerated.

Genesis 28:15

15 And, behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land; for I will not leave thee, until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of.

These promises are applied to Jacob while for twenty years he is not in Beersheba, not in Canaan, but in Syria, with the other half of the family. So that, figuratively, and therefore prophetically, these promises are fulfilled in the 2,000 years that lie between the first coming of Christ and His return. Whereby the promised blessings of the Jewish people, the salvation of the Jewish people and therefore of Esau, have been taken away and have gone with the believers. Jacob is a picture of that and has thus rightly come to the other half of the family and therefore to the ten tribes of Israel. That is of course typology. But literally it says that Jacob would indeed break forth as the dust of the earth, over the whole world. That is innumerable. All this is said in the dream. That in itself already stands for the dispensation of the mysteries of the Kingdom.

Moreover, it is a promise of regathering, for the story remains applicable even after our dispensation because then all twelve tribes of Israel will be regathered to Canaan. By then the Church has long been gone.

Laban means "white," and the only explanation I have been able to find for that is that "white" should also really be taken literally. From that it follows that the ten tribes of Israel then also consist of white people. That is of course very generalising, but that is roughly how it is. White and blond. Internationally one calls those people "the Europeans." Actually Laban also means that he has a white heart, that he is inwardly

also white, and that he is moreover “incense,” “a sweet savour unto the LORD.” In addition, Laban can very well be translated as “son,” in the sense that he would be appointed as son. That is also correct, but the son is then ultimately not Laban, but Jacob. The one who was “built” from him. Through his daughters, incidentally. Through the female and therefore through the earthly line.

Genesis 48

Joseph was king over and of Israel, but that could not really be the case yet, because there was as yet no Israel. Nevertheless, he was king over Israel. In that way he is a perfect picture of Christ in our day. There is as yet no converted Israel under the New Covenant, but nevertheless He is King. Joseph is not only a type of the Lord Jesus, but much more of Christ, including the Church. We find that truth extensively here. Hence it is a kingship outside a kingdom, even outside the promised land, in Egypt and therefore in captivity. And that while the whole rest of the family does not even officially know it. That is of course their own fault, but they know nothing about it. The brothers sold him to Egypt and thought they were rid of him, but in reality Joseph had become viceroy of Egypt. There he did the same as Melchizedek, namely bringing forth bread and wine. Ultimately the whole family is delivered by Joseph. That is also the whole story concerning the Church. We are in one way or another a part of Israel. In the future it will become clear that through this Israel is delivered. For when in the future Israel is delivered from her enemies here on earth, we shall be in heaven and we shall be the ones through whom that Kingdom will be established. We shall then be manifested with Him in glory and shall with Him reveal His Kingdom on earth. Joseph is a picture of that. At the end of the history of Joseph, who was hidden, he makes himself known. When Jacob is about to die the history repeats itself. The promises must be passed on. Jacob then first blesses the sons of Joseph. It is Israel, but not even the twelve tribes. He does not even bless Joseph first, but what came from Joseph: Ephraim and Manasseh. Typologically that is easy. “Joseph” is the name, just like the name “Israel” and “Ephraim,” that goes with the ten tribes of Israel. The Church comes forth from there, so that Ephraim and Manasseh together must be a picture of the Church, whereby the name “Manasseh” is actually the same as “Moses.” Manasseh or Moshe differs by only one letter. In the Bible they are even expressly linked with each other. There is even one occasion where Manasseh is written when Moses is meant. Manasseh stands for that part of the Church that comes from the Jewish people, who have lived under the law. From Moshe they have become Manasseh. A 5 or a 50 has been added, but that is typology again. These believers from the Jews have a share in the inheritance of Joseph. And on the other side stands Ephraim for the believers from the ten tribes. Whoever checks these names in all the places where they occur in the Bible will naturally discover that this is how it fits together.

Ephraim and Manasseh are blessed first. And they are blessed first because Joseph, whom they together represent among the twelve tribes of Israel, receives the birthright. After that the birthright goes, not with Manasseh, but with Ephraim. Again with the younger. And so the blessings of Joseph come primarily not to the believers from the Jews, but to the believers from the ten tribes. They too are exchanged. That is spoken of extensively in the Acts, although there the ten tribes are not named, but the Gentiles. There it says that the believers from the Jews must take an example from the believers

from the Gentiles. They set the standard. The order is therefore reversed. That Ephraim and Manasseh are exchanged is quoted in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Hebrews 11:21

21 By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph; and worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff.

Thereby he crossed his hands. Joseph thought that Jacob was doing this wrongly and did not know what he was doing, but Jacob said, "I know it, my son, I know it," for the mysteries were known to him. And deliberately he crossed his hands and laid his right hand on the one who stood on his left side. Ephraim did not seem to qualify for the birthright blessing, but nevertheless received it. So it goes in our day. The ten tribes did not seem to qualify, but nevertheless received the birthright blessing. That is what this Scripture portion is about.

Genesis 48:16

16 The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth.

The two together are a picture of the believers from the two and ten tribes of Israel. The Church, therefore. The blessings of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob pass to Joseph in general, but more particularly to Ephraim. They shall multiply as fish in multitude, in the midst of the land. The poor creatures. That is not their biotope at all. Fish belong in the sea. Nevertheless it says "in the midst of the land." In the sea it is "lo-ammi"; on the land it would be "ammi." The land is a picture of Israel and the sea is a picture of the nations. Is this now "ammi" or "lo-ammi"? Do they live on the land or in the sea? Both, for it depends on which side you look at things from. It is in the dispersion and is officially no longer called Israel. They have forgotten everything, but nevertheless it is the people of God, in particular on the ground of faith.

The fulness of the nations

Genesis 48:18-19

18 And Joseph said unto his father, Not so, my father: for this is the firstborn; put thy right hand upon his head.

19 And his father refused, and said, I know it, my son, I know it: he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations.

Jacob would not be persuaded. Manasseh, the Jewish people, shall also become great, but the younger shall become greater. In the original it says "a fulness of nations." For nations it again says "goy." So "a fulness of Gentiles." This expression stands in the Hebrew. Therefore the same expression is found only once more in the Greek New Testament. Here, however, in Genesis, that blessing is ascribed to Joseph and more particularly to Ephraim. Ephraim is also the usual name for the ten tribes. If you count all the tribes of Israel, you do not count the tribe of Joseph, but instead the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. Ephraim is the one who was added last, as the youngest and with least right. For Manasseh, as the eldest, stands in the same place as Joseph and those names can therefore theoretically be used interchangeably. Ephraim is added extra. But to him, to the thirteenth tribe, the birthright of Israel is given. That means that, since the name of the firstborn is subsequently applied to the rest of the family, that name is therefore also applied to the rest of Israel. The name of Ephraim can therefore

be used for all twelve tribes. Just as the name Israel can be used for that purpose. The head of the family is decisive. We are speaking about the Levitical priesthood, but it is also called the Aaronic priesthood, because Aaron was after all the head of the house of Levi.

At the later division of the two (Judah and Benjamin) and the ten tribes the name of Judah went with the two tribes, the Jews therefore. The name of the most important of the two tribes is used. To that tribe the Kingdom was after all promised and so the name of that tribe passes to the whole people. On the other side exactly the same thing happens. To the ten tribes the name of Ephraim is given, for that was the tribe with the official birthright. Moreover, the first king of the ten tribes was also from Ephraim: Jeroboam.

Of Ephraim it is therefore said that he would become “a fulness of Gentiles.” If you apply that statement as broadly as possible, it is here about the ten tribes of Israel. Since the division of the kingdom you can no longer say that it is about the twelve tribes of Israel. The promise of “the fulness of the nations” is therefore made to the ten tribes of Israel, under the name of “Ephraim.” If this were figurative, because the Church is spoken of here, it is at any rate established that there is a direct connection between the ten tribes of Israel and the Church. All the statements in the Old Testament about the Church moreover have a literal, ordinary, direct, earthly and sometimes even rather insignificant fulfilment. The great difference is that in the preceding statements it was spoken about Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who would become “a multitude of nations,” and here in the translation unfortunately the term “multitude” stands, but “a multitude of nations” is in a certain respect still something different from “a fulness of nations.” That a multitude is meant is clear, but that word is not there. It says “fulness of nations.” That does not presuppose a division into different nations, with different kingdoms, but a gathering of nations under one King. I cannot entirely justify the latter, but I mean it more as a picture. It means that they are nations that are brought together and as it were become one. That is the difference with the preceding expression. I believe that “the multitude of nations” refers to the Anglo-Saxon group. To the descendants of the ten tribes of Israel. I also believe that “fulness of nations”—in the sense of a unity—refers to the Church, which incidentally comes forth from the Anglo-Saxon group.

It appears that this term “fulness of the Gentiles” occurs again in Romans 11. I realise that as an argument in practice it is weak again, simply because Romans 11 is generally very poorly understood. There is such an astonishing amount in that one chapter that it is therefore indeed poorly understood. That weakens the argument, but actually this is one of the strongest arguments. Namely that the statement about “fulness of the nations” in the New Testament is made only about the Church. So that according to the normal method of Bible study no other conclusion can be drawn than that the Church of our day comes forth from Ephraim and therefore from Joseph. That is the only, purely literal conclusion. The problem, however, is that although one can link those expressions with each other in that way, on the other hand the expression in Romans 11 naturally stands in the context of Romans 11 and not of Genesis 48. The question is whether one even sees and understands that connection at all. In Romans 11 it is spoken about the stumbling of natural Israel, whereby incidentally Paul’s brethren according to the flesh are meant. Therefore under the name Israel the Jews must in the first place be understood. He speaks about Israel, but that is because he knows that the salvation, all the promises of God, are intended for Israel. But what in those days was

known under the name Israel has indeed stumbled. He establishes that as a consequence a judgment would come upon the Jewish people (Israel), because many Scripture passages in the Old Testament say that. He quotes some of them here.

Romans 11:8

8 (According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day.

It is known that that is a statement about the Jewish people.

Romans 11:9

9 And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompence unto them.

The table stands for the Jewish community. That is the Judaistic and therefore the legalistic community. So that precisely that life under the law becomes to them a snare, trap, stumblingblock and recompence. Precisely life under the law prevents man in practice from coming to faith in the Lord Jesus.

Romans 11:10-11

10 Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway.

11 I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy.

It was not the intention that they should stumble, but it was the intention that their fall would lead to the salvation of the Gentiles. We just established that “Israel” stands, but that only a part of Israel is meant. So “Gentiles” also stands, but in particular the ten tribes are meant by that. With which it is not said that the salvation would not be intended for the nations as such. Of course it is. But I am firmly convinced that the apostle primarily thinks of something he does not write and may not write. There are quite a few Scripture passages in which Paul speaks about Gentiles. It seems that he then speaks about the Gentiles in general, but if you check the context it appears that he is speaking about a special category of Gentiles. He does simply write “Gentiles,” but he thinks of something else. Through the fall of the Jewish people salvation has come to the Gentiles, to provoke them to jealousy. There you have the jealousy of Esau for Jacob. The salvation has been sent to Jacob, for Esau has stumbled, so that Jacob would provoke Esau to jealousy. That has also happened. Esau sought to kill Jacob. And exactly so it went at the beginning of our dispensation, whereby the Jews sought to kill the Christians.

Romans 11:12

12 Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness!

“Their fall” is the fall of the Jewish people. In practice it was simply their unbelief. Their diminishing is the riches of the Gentiles. Their being set back—“Esau have I hated”—refers to the Jews and not to Esau. That is again in Malachi. That has nothing more to do with Esau. Their being set back—the word “hated” has the same meaning—is to the riches of the Gentiles. How much more their fulness! The fulness of the Jewish people. If the fall of the Jewish people is to be the riches of the Gentiles, how much more shall their fulness bring blessings to the Gentiles. That is what it says. Here the future conversion of the Jewish people is in view. If Israel’s unbelief already brings such great blessings to the nations, how much more will their fulness bring blessings to the

nations. If “their fall” is their unbelief, then “their fulness” is their faith, their conversion. It then literally concerns a believing Jewish people. For it was a literally unbelieving people, of whom a minority, incidentally, did believe. Through that unbelieving Jewish people salvation has gone to the Gentiles. But in the future there will be a literally believing Jewish people, of whom a minority, incidentally, will not believe and will be cut off. That believing Jewish people is indicated here by the term “their fulness.” If it is then spoken of “the fulness of the Gentiles,” it therefore concerns believers from the Gentiles.

Romans 11:25

25 For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.

The Jewish people will indeed come to conversion in the future, but that will only be when the fulness of the Gentiles has come in. In short, there will be a fulness of the Jews, even a fulness of all Israel, but that will only be after the fulness of the Gentiles has come in. “The fulness of the Gentiles” is thereby the term for the Church. The believers from the Gentiles. Not all Gentiles, but only the believers from the Gentiles. The fall of the Jewish people does not refer to all Jews, but to the unbelieving Jews, and that is admittedly a majority. Their fulness consists of believers from the Jews. Again not all, but again the majority. Fulness presupposes a unity, and that is what it is about here, namely the Church. With which, incidentally, an immediate answer is given to the question of what that fulness of the Gentiles actually goes into. It does not say that a “time” comes in, but that a “fulness” comes in somewhere. It is simply speaking about the taking up of the Church. It does not say where that fulness comes in, because that is a mystery and that is not the subject here either.

The hardening has come upon Israel only in part. Literally this means that the hardening has come only upon the unbelieving part, and if we still want to generalise, then we must say that the hardening has come upon the two tribes. That is only a part of Israel. That hardening lasts until the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in. If you set those two over against each other, on the one side stands the “fall” and the “fulness” of the two tribes of the Jewish people, after which the question is who those Gentiles then are. The fulness of whom? That must then be the fulness of the ten tribes. It does not have to be, one can easily get round that, but that thought simply forces itself upon one. Apart from the ten tribes, “the fulness of the Gentiles” is the designation of the Church. Nevertheless, the promise concerning who would become “fulness of the Gentiles” is made in Genesis 48 and indeed to Ephraim. If you lay those two Scripture passages side by side, then the conclusion must be drawn that the Church in general comes forth from Ephraim and therefore from Joseph. That is the only, purely literal conclusion. The problem, however, is that although one can link those expressions with each other in that way, on the other hand the expression in Romans 11 naturally stands in the context of Romans 11 and not of Genesis 48. The question is whether one even sees and understands that connection at all. In Romans 11 it is spoken about the stumbling of natural Israel, whereby incidentally Paul’s brethren according to the flesh are meant. Therefore under the name Israel the Jews must in the first place be understood. He speaks about Israel, but that is because he knows that the salvation, all the promises of God, are intended for Israel. But what in those days was known under the name Israel has indeed stumbled. He establishes that as a consequence a judgment would come

upon the Jewish people (Israel), because many Scripture passages in the Old Testament say that. He quotes some of them here.

Two olive trees

In Romans 11 it is about two olive trees. Branches are broken off from the cultivated olive tree. From the context and from the explanation it is clear what it is about. The olive tree specifically concerns the Jews. Branches are broken off from the fruitful olive tree. The branches that bear no fruit are broken off. It could also have been a vine, but that stands somewhere else. They are unbelieving branches. The others remain. Other branches will be grafted into that same cultivated olive tree. It is spoken about the root and the stem and the branches. They are all mentioned. The salvation and the promises made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are the root or the stem of Israel. The branches are the Jewish people that is grafted onto that stem. But most of the branches are then taken off and other branches are grafted in in those same places. In the thought that Israel has been cut off and the Church has come in the place of Israel there is a great ground of truth. The unbelieving Jewish people is indeed cut off. There do remain branches—believing Jews—on that tree, because they do bear fruit, and the Gentiles are grafted into that same tree. So that we, believers from the Gentiles, have indeed become partakers of “the fatness” of this olive tree. That is the meaning and nothing is taken away from that. But something is added. What it is all about, and one reads so easily over that, is that unnatural branches are grafted in. The branches that are grafted onto that cultivated olive tree, so that they should bear fruit from that cultivated olive tree, are branches from a wild olive tree. It was already established that the olive tree in any case stands for the Jewish people that was unbelieving. They are declared unbelieving because they heard the gospel and rejected it. So it can only be the Jewish people, for to them the gospel was preached. Also after the resurrection of Christ. If the cultivated olive tree is now a picture of the two tribes, then the wild olive tree must be a picture of the ten tribes. The thought is that the ten tribes have a share in the blessings of the two tribes, and from the two tribes the Messiah does indeed come forth. The branches on that tree are in the majority branches from that other, unfruitful tree, whose branches are nevertheless made fruitful. Publicans are a picture of the ten tribes. Harlots and publicans are considered in Israel as sinners, but it appears that both harlots and publicans are actually a picture of the ten tribes of Israel that are unfaithful. For the harlot is unfaithful to the husband and runs away from him. Harlotry in Scripture is simply unfaithfulness. The publicans picture the same thing, but then in the masculine. Publicans are Jews, but they serve the enemy. They are part of the Roman, worldly system. They collect taxes for the emperor. So they serve other nations. That is also a picture of the ten tribes. It is actually Israel, but it is part of the Gentile system. Zacchaeus, the publican, was plucked from a wild fig tree. The cultivated fig tree is a picture of the Jewish people and the wild one of that part of Israel that bears no fruit. The ten tribes, therefore. Zacchaeus is also immediately taken away. The Lord goes into a house with him and leaves the whole multitude outside. That is always a picture of our dispensation. A hidden Kingdom, outside the revealed things. We still know a few harlots and publicans from the Bible. With them you always get exactly the same story. In Genesis 48 it is about a fulness of nations. The only other time that term is used is in Romans 11. In that verse it is spoken about the one part that is “lo-ammi” and the other part that is “ammi.” Afterwards it is reversed again and then everything still comes

together. In the past I have always found it very difficult to apply that line of thought to the Jews or to Israel as a whole and the Gentiles, but afterwards it suddenly proves to be a good story if you do not apply it to Israel and the Gentiles in general, but to the two and the ten tribes in particular. As long as the two tribes have a separate relationship with the Lord, the ten tribes stand absolutely completely outside the lines and do not count. At the moment that the two tribes become “lo-ammi” and are put outside because of their fall, then suddenly the ten tribes appear again. Then they come to the Lord. That is what the following verses of Romans 11 are about. About the disobedience of the one category over against the obedience of the other and then the other way round. Paul says that this is logical and righteous and that it simply goes like that and yet everything still comes right. And then Paul bursts out into his well-known doxology.

Romans 11:33-36

33 O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!

34 For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?

35 Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?

36 For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen.

If that applies anywhere, it certainly applies to this line of reasoning. Here is another nice point: it is , and not an acknowledged Israel. Ephraim is the thirteenth tribe and an acknowledged Israel always consists of twelve tribes. But that thirteenth tribe receives the birthright. One can therefore say that the birthright of Israel does not come to Israel at all. Not to the twelve in any case. That the Church is established as having the birthright above Israel is of course one of the most obvious arguments for the story. That is exactly the line of thought in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the term “church of the firstborn” occurs. It concerns the Church and Israel after the flesh. That birthright only means something if there is a birthright above Israel, but also if the birthright is in Israel. Both are true: above Israel and even above the twelve tribes, but still in and in the midst of Israel—only then it is that one, namely the thirteenth tribe and therefore Ephraim.

In Jeremiah 31 it says that God is a Father to Israel and Ephraim is His firstborn (verse 9). Jeremiah 31 is that beautiful chapter about the New Covenant. A large part of this chapter is even quoted literally in Hebrews 8. But the interesting thing is that only from verse 27 is Judah spoken of. The whole preceding portion concerns Israel and Ephraim. About the New Covenant of Ephraim. Only in verse 27 is it Israel and Judah. In verse 31 follows the important statement that is also quoted in Hebrews: “Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah.”

The order is also here: first Israel and then Judah. And even if the order here is not decisive, it should still be clear that the whole chapter speaks about the New Covenant and that there it is expressly spoken only about Israel and about Ephraim and therefore about the ten tribes. Only in the second part is Judah also spoken of. The thought is therefore that the first portion actually does not speak about Israel in the future, but about the Church in our day, preceding the still future conversion of Judah. That order, Israel and Judah, is a very important one in Scripture. This is also the chapter where it says that God would create something new upon the earth. “A woman shall compass a man.” We then say that that woman is Israel and that under the New Covenant she will

compass the Man. That is also so, but again, that stands in verse 22, while only in verse 27 is there first mention of Judah. If you follow the line, then the backsliding daughter, who one day, seen from Jeremiah, will compass the Man, is not the twelve or the thirteen or the two tribes, but the ten tribes. From them the Church would be born.

Genesis 48:20

20 And he blessed them that day, saying, In thee shall Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh: and he set Ephraim before Manasseh. I do not know whether they ever say that in Israel, for Ephraim and Manasseh may have been two large tribes, but they are lost together with eight others. How can one say, “God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh”? God makes nothing at all. God neglects them. They become lost and are without trace. The point is that this combination of names stands for the Church. From the ten first and afterwards also from the two tribes. That will undoubtedly be a statement that will only receive its full meaning later. In the days when all twelve tribes are regathered under the New Covenant, under the kingship of Christ, the revealed kingship. Then it is: “God make thee as the Church.” There are no greater blessings than that.

The parable of the prodigal son also has the same meaning, for the son who was never away is there literally compared with the Pharisees and scribes, Judaism therefore. And the son who was away is compared with the harlots and publicans. There is of course a much deeper application behind it. It is not about scribes and Pharisees, but about the two tribes as such. They had never been away, never lost, but the ten tribes had. They come in one or another strange way—for it is not told how—to repentance, to knowledge of themselves. They suddenly know again who they are and what responsibility they bear and then return to the Lord. To the Father, that is. Not as a son, but as a servant. But the Father nevertheless appoints him as son, whereupon the other therefore becomes jealous.

Genesis 49

Only in chapter 49 are the sons of Jacob themselves blessed. Here we discuss only the blessing on Joseph, for he is the one who is blessed most. In connection with Judah, kingship is at most just touched on here.

Genesis 49:22

22 Joseph is a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well; whose branches run over the wall.

Was it now the wild or the cultivated olive tree? First it was one branch and later apparently two. The branches end up outside the garden, outside the court. A wall is actually a picture of the law. Ephraim and Manasseh and therefore Joseph end up somewhere you would not expect them. They leap over the barrier. That is exactly the position of the Church. The Church has after all no earthly destination or an earthly Kingdom, but over the wall and in heaven. Or behind the veil.

Genesis 49:23-24

23 The archers have sorely grieved him, and shot at him, and hated him:

24 But his bow abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob; (from thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel:) That last part does not stand there, but it could have. They are words of the same purport. That the gates of hell would not prevail against him are words

about the Church. The thought is that the Church would be persecuted, but would nevertheless continue to exist. Here it is said of Joseph in other words: By the hands of the mighty God of Jacob; (from thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel:) Joseph is shepherd of the mighty God of Jacob. God Himself appointed Joseph as shepherd over Israel. That was not fulfilled when Joseph was in Egypt, for that had already been. The point is precisely that this history of Joseph and his kingdom, of the Israelite kingdom outside Canaan and certainly outside the land, is prophetic for the situation in our dispensation. The Shepherd is Christ, the Son of Joseph. He was incidentally also His cousin. The Lord Jesus also has everything to do with Joseph, even as regards family relationships. But these promises to Joseph are fulfilled in the first place in the Lord Jesus, since His first coming. He is that King with a Kingdom outside natural Israel and certainly outside the land. A hidden Kingdom therefore, a Kingdom that no one would have suspected. For the stone which the builders—the two tribes—rejected would become the head of the corner. The question is who did that. Yes, it is of the LORD, it then says. But if the two tribes rejected Him then it could very well be the ten who did not stumble over the Stone.

Genesis 49:25

25 Even by the God of thy father, who shall help thee; and by the Almighty, who shall bless thee with blessings of heaven above, blessings of the deep that lieth under, blessings of the breasts, and of the womb:

When it speaks about God who shall help, it is always about the One who would give help in due time. The One who is Helper. That is Melchizedek, the High Priest of the New Covenant. Where we come with boldness to the throne of grace that does not stand in the camp, but outside it, not in Canaan but in Egypt, not on earth but in heaven, we receive grace, mercy and help in due time. The Helper is by definition the Mediator of the New Covenant. That is important when reading the Psalms, for the concept of helping occurs quite often there. It is actually derived from the original son of Abraham, Eliezer, who was not his son. That name means “God is help.” Thereby it is also derived from the son of Aaron, the first high priest. This one was called Eleazar and that also means: “God is help.” In both cases it concerns a type of the New Testament priesthood of Christ.

“Blessings from above” naturally also has to do with the blessings of the New Covenant: who has blessed us with every spiritual blessing in heavenly places in Christ. It is not, however, only about spiritual blessings, but also about earthly ones. “Egypt” and “the deep” lie very close to each other. The difference is in practice often not to be indicated at all. “Breasts” and “womb” again have to do with fruitfulness and becoming “a multitude or fulness of nations.” It is the continuation of the promises to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

Genesis 49:26

26 The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills: they shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that was separate from his brethren.

“The everlasting hills” have everything to do with the fact that He has chosen us before the foundation of the world and that He has called us as the Church according to His eternal purpose. The calling of the Church was therefore already fixed before the foundation of the world. That is of course deliberately added, because otherwise one

might think that, because of the unbelief of Israel, God in His vexation has simply gathered another people. And many think that that is definitively another people. They believe that Israel has completely done with God and that it is now about the church. It is, however, no change in God's plan, but part of God's plan.

In the broadest sense "Joseph" means all ten tribes. "And on the crown of the head..." "and" is namely. Joseph would be separated from his brethren. In the sense that the ten tribes would be separated from the two and that they would end up somewhere else. To which must be added that the concept of separation actually corresponds with the Naziriteship. It is synonymous with sanctification. Separation from the world as such and on the other side a dedication to the Lord. In sanctification the emphasis lies on the connection with the living God and in separation the emphasis lies on being separated from the world, but it certainly also means: in connection with God. The Naziriteship has to do with making a promise to God (see Numbers 6). As far as we know that is later applied only to Samson. But ultimately it was of course applied to Christ and through Christ to the Church. Jesus of Nazareth can also be taken as Jesus the Nazarene, namely the "Separated One," He who is dedicated to God. He would admittedly lose His hair and thereby His strength, but He would certainly receive that strength back. For Samson is simply a type of the Lord in His first coming. As Samson was shorn, the Lord was shorn as a sheep that is dumb before its shearers. Samson was incidentally also dumb when his hair was shorn. He said nothing, for he was asleep. And he lost his strength through the woman. It fits in every respect.

Genesis 49:27-28

27 Benjamin shall ravine as a wolf: in the morning he shall devour the prey, and at night he shall divide the spoil.

28 All these are the twelve tribes of Israel: and this is it that their father spake unto them, and blessed them; every one according to his blessing he blessed them.

If you count the tribes, there are not twelve but thirteen. Nevertheless it says twelve, so that the thirteenth nevertheless falls somewhere outside the boat. That is now such a reference to the Church.

Deuteronomy 33

Here it is not Jacob, but Moses, who pronounces blessings upon the tribes of Israel in general and upon Joseph in particular. Moses does this on the eve of the entry into Canaan and, moreover—if you ask me—on the day of his death.

Deuteronomy 33:7

7 And this is the blessing of Judah: and he said, Hear, LORD, the voice of Judah, and bring him unto his people: let his hands be sufficient for him; and be thou an help to him from his enemies.

Judah is expected to pray. He then prays that he may be brought back to his people. If that is fulfilled it means that Judah, and in the broader sense the two tribes, are brought back to their people, to the ten tribes. It is therefore not the intention that the ten tribes should join themselves to Judah, but exactly the opposite. The ten tribes are the standard; that is the people. Judah has departed from that people. I shall speak about that later when we come to the division of the kingdom after Solomon. There it is stated extensively and clearly enough that Judah departed from Israel. Moreover, it says that the Lord Himself gave the ten tribes—there should actually have been eleven—to

Jeroboam. The man from Joseph, or rather Ephraim. But for the sake of the promises to David the tribe of Judah also remained separate and the royal house of David remained fixed in Judah and therefore in the two tribes. Only the tribe of Benjamin went with Judah. That is a beautiful side effect, for Benjamin was the full brother of Joseph, so that the ten tribes were nevertheless represented with Judah and therefore with the two tribes. In addition, the tribe of Benjamin was actually completely wiped out. They then remained alive because Benjamin received wives from all Israel, so that all the tribes of Israel were in fact represented in Benjamin with Judah. But with great emphasis Joseph was represented in it, if only because Benjamin was the only real brother of Joseph, from the same mother.

When Paul in Romans 11 says that God has not cast away His people, we say that this is because there is a remnant among the Jews, such as Paul himself and others. But Paul is of the tribe of Benjamin. Whereupon the next question arises: did Paul, as regards descent, stand closer to the Jews or to Joseph? Closer to Joseph of course, because he is from Benjamin, the full brother of Joseph. It is nevertheless remarkable that the believing remnant among the Jews is represented under the name "Benjamin" and that upon closer inspection the name "Benjamin" precisely links with the ten tribes. The great man, as regards Church truth in connection with our dispensation, proves indeed to have a closer relationship, as regards origin, with Joseph than with Judah.

Judah is regarded as the one who has departed from Israel. That is by no means always so, for under other circumstances the ten tribes are regarded as having departed and been carried away. But here in Deuteronomy 33 Judah is the one who has departed.

"Bring him back to his people." Here the word "people" really stands for "am." So Judah has departed from the people of God. Those are almost the words of Paul. He wished that his people, his departed brethren according to the flesh, might come to faith. Nothing is then said about the ten tribes, but it is about the two. The Lord will ultimately have mercy on Judah. The prayer of Judah will one day be heard and God will then give Judah help under the New Covenant.

Deuteronomy 33:8

8 And of Levi he said, Let thy Thummim and thy Urim be with thy holy one, whom thou didst prove at Massah, and with whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah.

With these words Moses takes the priesthood, represented in the Urim and Thummim, from Levi and gives it to the Lord. Verse 7 speaks about a future restoration of Judah and verse 8 speaks about the priesthood that will be taken from Levi and given to Jehovah Himself. That can of course only be explained if the Lord Jesus Christ is no one else than Jehovah Himself. And He is indeed the Mediator of the New Covenant, so that all these statements have directly to do with the breaking in of the New Covenant. When the New Covenant breaks in, Judah has departed. When Judah prays he will be brought back to his people and have a share in Christ. One can also say that Judah will then have a share in Joseph. The priesthood is taken from Levi. That priesthood forms part of the birthright and that will yet be given to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of David, or rather the Son of Joseph.

Deuteronomy 33:13

13 And of Joseph he said, Blessed of the LORD be his land, for the precious things of heaven, for the dew, and for the deep that coucheth beneath,

Here too it immediately speaks again about blessings from heaven. Further, they are roughly the same words as in Genesis 49.

Deuteronomy 33:14

14 And for the precious fruits brought forth by the sun, and for the precious things put forth by the moon,

“Put forth” is the same as fruit. A fruit is after all brought forth. Here the stars are missing, which are always connected with Joseph.

Deuteronomy 33:15

15 And for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills,

Both expressions coincide and have to do with the things that have been laid up for Joseph from of old. It refers to the calling of the Church.

Deuteronomy 33:16

16 And for the precious things of the earth and fulness thereof, and for the good will of him that dwelt in the bush: let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the top of the head of him that was separated from his brethren.

While Joseph is separated from his brethren, he receives those blessings. In Genesis 49 this same thing stood at the end of the history of Joseph, who had been separated from his brethren and had been exceedingly blessed. He had become viceroy in Egypt and, so to speak, the deliverer of the whole world of that time. One can of course say that the blessing Jacob pronounces is highly coloured by the events that had just taken place and that were not yet finished. Joseph was after all still viceroy of Egypt. But here in Deuteronomy 33 one cannot say that, because this is pronounced almost forty years after the exodus from Egypt. Nevertheless the same blessings are repeated, so that one sees that not only the statements of Moses, but also those of Jacob and even the whole history of Joseph are clearly prophetic and would and will all take place later. Not Judah and the king from the house of Judah, but Joseph is then appointed firstborn and even king. That makes Matthew 1 so interesting, because there we meet a Joseph, a son of David. So still Judah, but he is called Joseph. He then disappears from the scene, as is customary with a Joseph.

Deuteronomy 33:17

17 His glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns are like the horns of unicorns: with them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth: and they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh.

In the KJV the translation of “unicorn” is “rə·’êm.” This word is connected with “Rama” and with “Aram,” that is Syria. It speaks of a high position. Unless there is evidence to the contrary that is always the position of the Church, which is seated with Christ in heaven. The Bible teaches that this “rə·’êm” is an aurochs. Such an old-fashioned, strong, extinct species of cattle. Moreover such an ox was untameable. It had not only great strength, but was also in no way to be tamed. One could also not harness it to a plough or harrow. If one takes that literally and applies it to Joseph and the ten tribes, it means exactly the same. He was not to be tamed. He was carried away into Assyrian captivity, but was not to be tamed. He immediately disappeared again to the north and was never really subjected. One recognises it at any rate in Britain and Scandinavia. Those countries have also never been subjected. They have sometimes made

agreements, but have never been conquered. Not to mention North America. Really separated and absolutely not to be tamed.

Horns stand in any case for strength and kingdom. In practice the Saxon peoples have subjected the whole world to themselves. That there is a turning point in that in our days is clear, but that of course leads up to the return of Christ, whereby these peoples will be brought back to the land where they actually belong, to the land that God has destined for them. Ephraim remains greater than Manasseh. The one horn was greater than the other horn of this aurochs.

Joseph therefore receives from Moses the most extensive blessing. A blessing that on the one hand certainly has to do with heavenly things, but on the other hand expressly speaks also about great earthly blessings. The blessings to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were less than those to Joseph, while Joseph is after all actually the limitation. One tribe of Israel, perhaps two tribes and in the broadest sense ten, but it is a limitation. In any case the tribe of Judah and in the broader sense also that of Benjamin, stand completely aside.

Jeremiah 31

Jeremiah 31:3-5

3 The LORD hath appeared of old unto me, saying, Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love: therefore with lovingkindness have I drawn thee.

4 Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel: thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry.

5 Thou shalt yet plant vineyards upon the mountains of Samaria: the planters shall plant, and shall eat the fruit of them.

It must therefore be about the ten tribes here. For they are not the mountains of Judea, but of Samaria. The city of Samaria was the capital of the ten-tribe kingdom.

Jeremiah 31:6

6 For there shall be a day, that the watchmen upon the mount Ephraim shall cry, Arise ye, and let us go up to Zion unto the LORD our God.

The name of Israel is here replaced by that of Ephraim, but the meaning remains the same. To Zion? So still Jerusalem? It does not say Jerusalem! The term "Zion" has in a high degree a spiritual meaning. That is what it is primarily always about with Zion.

When it is quoted in Hebrews it says: "Ye are not come unto Sinai, but unto Sion, the city of the living God." Only in the second instance does it say that it is Jerusalem, but then it is not about the ordinary earthly Jerusalem, but about the heavenly Jerusalem. For it is not about Judah and Jerusalem, but about Israel, Ephraim, Samaria and Zion, and that is the designation of the Kingdom under the New Covenant. That can very well be in a higher meaning and in a hidden form.

Jeremiah 31:7

7 For thus saith the LORD; Sing with gladness for Jacob, and shout among the chief of the nations: publish ye, praise ye, and say, O LORD, save thy people, the remnant of Israel.

Jacob stands in the line of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Ephraim. All those names can be used in exactly the same meaning. So one still arrives at the ten tribes. The same applies to the remnant of Israel. If it were about the two tribes it would have to be

stated, but that does not happen here. Moreover, Jacob is here regarded as the chief of the nations.

Jeremiah 31:8-9

8 Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth, and with them the blind and the lame, the woman with child and her that travaileth with child together: a great company shall return thither.

9 They shall come with weeping, and with supplications will I lead them: I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters in a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble: for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn.

First the north and then the coasts of the earth. The north is the most important. Afterwards the east and west and south. But the emphasis lies on the north. That is so because the deportation of Israel took place via the north. They eventually came to live in Media. From there they spread over the whole earth and they will therefore also be regathered from all corners of the earth, from all sides. One could also explain the expression the other way round. It admittedly means that they were driven to the north, but that they did not stay there, but spread to all sides over the earth. These verses cannot refer to the return of the two tribes from the Babylonian captivity, for they subsequently did stumble, namely at the Stone of stumbling. It is Israel and Ephraim. That incidentally also means, if one takes it literally, that the first part that comes to faith is not the two tribes, but the ten. The Church is the firstborn. And here the Church is called Ephraim, or rather Israel. It speaks about the New Covenant in its application in our day. Judah is absolutely not mentioned.

Jeremiah 31:10

10 Hear the word of the LORD, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock.

So still Gentile nations. It can of course just as well be all Gentiles, but equally well in the limitation of the ten tribes. "Isles" is translated as coastlands and north-west Europe, whither those peoples were scattered, does indeed consist of coastlands, islands and peninsulas. He who scattered Israel gathers the Church from all nations. Not to the land of Canaan, but to heaven. He keeps them as a shepherd keeps his flock. Christ is the Shepherd. He is already described in our day as our Shepherd.

Jeremiah 31:11

11 For the LORD hath redeemed Jacob, and ransomed him from the hand of him that was stronger than he.

If it were a woman who was redeemed then it would have been Gomer. Gomer was the wife of Hosea, who gave birth to Jezreel, Lo-ruhamah and Lo-ammi. Gomer then suddenly proves to have disappeared. We would not have noticed that if she had not been bought back on the slave market. She was bought! There is no doubt that that is a picture of how the LORD buys Israel back. Hosea bought Gomer back. She has admittedly been redeemed, ransomed from the hand of him that was stronger. It simply says that this woman was a picture of the people of Israel. She would remain many days without a god, without a Messiah, without teraphim, without an ephod, without a priest. Completely without anything therefore. Only afterwards, years later, would the children of Israel inquire after the LORD their God.

We do say that it is Israel, but there is a problem attached to it. For is it not so that when Hosea bought Gomer back she simply became Hosea's wife again? Yet there is no

mention of communion. For he would have no communion with her. She would be without a husband and he would be without a wife. A situation is brought about with which nothing is done and that situation would only change after many days. Here it is explained how Israel, which had become “lo-ammi,” becomes “ammi” again. How the twelve tribes of Israel will be converted. Meanwhile Hosea has bought that woman and she lives there in his house. He will no doubt have cared for her, but nothing further. That is a perfect description of the situation in our day. God has bought Israel, but He has precisely sent the two tribes away. That is something different from buying back. That is of course a problem and I shall leave that for the moment. In any case it applies to the ten tribes that God has bought them. But He does nothing with them. It plays no role of significance. That woman (the ten tribes) is not even mentioned by name. That that woman is called Gomer is not stated. One can therefore deny it, although it nevertheless seems obvious that it was so. That woman is simply there, but unknown. That is a perfect picture of the situation as we know it today of the ten tribes.

Jeremiah 31:12

12 Therefore they shall come and sing in the height of Zion, and shall flow together to the goodness of the LORD, for wheat, and for wine, and for oil, and for the young of the flock and of the herd: and their soul shall be as a watered garden; and they shall not sorrow any more at all.

Upon closer inspection the One raised from the dead is therefore still the Gardener after all. That is what Mary Magdalene said, the harlot who had come to faith in the Lord Jesus. She too is a picture of the ten tribes of Israel. Her sister is a picture of the two tribes.

Jeremiah 31:13-15

13 Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance, both young men and old together: for I will turn their mourning into joy, and will comfort them, and make them rejoice from their sorrow.

14 And I will satiate the soul of the priests with fatness, and my people shall be satisfied with my goodness, saith the LORD.

15 Thus saith the LORD; A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation, and bitter weeping; Rahel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not.

Joseph is gone and possibly Benjamin too. But in the first place Joseph. They say that this is applied to the slaughter of the children in Bethlehem. That will no doubt be so, but the whole history of the slaughter of the children in Bethlehem, whereby everything that had been born within a period of two years was killed, is a picture of our dispensation.

The 2,000 years of our dispensation of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven.

There the children of Rachel are gone. Joseph is lost, already 2,000 years long. That does not take away the fact that the Son of Joseph, whom it was about and whom they thought they had killed and who is therefore gone, is in Egypt. For the Lord Jesus is then, together with Joseph, in Egypt. In Israel they say that there are no children in Bethlehem. They are there, but then in Egypt. The ten tribes are not there, but they are there for one finds them back in the Church. That is not in Israel, but outside it; on a completely different level, somewhere else.

Jeremiah 31:16-18

16 Thus saith the LORD; Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from

tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the LORD; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy.

17 And there is hope in thine end, saith the LORD, that thy children shall come again to their own border.

18 I have surely heard Ephraim bemoaning himself thus; Thou hast chastised me, and I was chastised, as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke: turn thou me, and I shall be turned; for thou art the LORD my God.

That is what Ephraim says and “broadly” the ten tribes say that: “Thou hast chastised me, Thou hast carried me away, Thou hast estranged me from the citizenship of Israel. Turn Thou me, and I shall be turned.” For ever, is the thought. They say that in captivity and the Lord has heard that.

Jeremiah 31:19

19 Surely after that I was turned, I repented; and after that I was instructed, I smote upon my thigh: I was ashamed, yea, even confounded, because I did bear the reproach of my youth.

Ephraim and the ten tribes will be made known to themselves. They will know who they are. That can be both literal and figurative. Assuming that you happen to belong to one of the ten tribes and you have come to faith, then you now know who you are. Namely people of God. No longer strangers from the citizenship of Israel, but fellowcitizens with the saints and of the household of God (Ephesians 2). Ephraim smites upon his thigh. Jacob was also touched in his thigh. When he came to conversion he could only walk on one leg. The other had been touched. One leg or thigh became unusable and therefore he had to limp on the other. The leg that became unusable was Judah and where he continued to walk was Ephraim. That is of course typology again. The reproach of the ten tribes came into operation already when they were carried away into captivity. While the two tribes were only definitively carried away at the beginning of our era, 750 years later.

Jeremiah 31:20

20 Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child? for since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still: therefore my bowels are troubled for him; I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the LORD.

In the New Testament it is said: “Ye, who were lo-ruhamah, but are now ruhamah, ye, not beloved, are now beloved.” There one should think of this prophecy. And this prophecy is here applied exclusively to the ten tribes.

Jeremiah 31:21-22

21 Set thee up waymarks, make thee high heaps: set thine heart toward the highway, even the way which thou wentest: turn again, O virgin of Israel, turn again to these thy cities.

22 How long wilt thou go about, O thou backsliding daughter? for the LORD hath created a new thing in the earth, A woman shall compass a man.

So that communion does after all arise. Thus the Lord does after all come to His goal with the ten tribes, while one does not find that in the whole Old Testament biblical history. Still not a word has been spoken about Judah, or about the twelve tribes.

Jeremiah 31:23-25, 27

23 Thus saith the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel; As yet they shall use this speech in the land of Judah and in the cities thereof, when I shall bring again their captivity; The LORD bless thee, O habitation of justice, and mountain of holiness.

24 And there shall dwell in Judah itself, and in all the cities thereof together, husbandmen, and they that go forth with flocks.

25 For I have satiated the weary soul, and I have replenished every sorrowful soul.

27 Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man, and with the seed of beast. The days come that the LORD will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of men and the seed of beasts. But the preceding, at any rate up to verse 23, was only about the house of Israel and not about the house of Judah. Judah had after all departed from the house of Israel.

Jeremiah 31:28-33

28 And it shall come to pass, that like as I have watched over them, to pluck up, and to break down, and to throw down, and to destroy, and to afflict; so will I watch over them, to build, and to plant, saith the LORD.

29 In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children's teeth are set on edge.

30 But every one shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge.

31 Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah:

32 Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD:

33 But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people.

The LORD will therefore after those days make a covenant with Israel.

In verse 33 the name Judah is gone again. One can of course say that Judah is now included, but nevertheless Judah is here again pushed aside. These words are applied in Hebrews to our day, to the Church, but ultimately it is of course the description of the whole New Covenant that will also be literally applied to all twelve, or rather thirteen tribes of Israel. That does not take away the fact that here it is expressly spoken about the ten tribes right up to the middle of the chapter. Only afterwards about the two and that is what it is about. The story about the ten tribes speaks about our dispensation and the period after that. When the two tribes are also spoken of it concerns the future conversion of the Jewish people, after which they too will have a share in the New Covenant. It is not quite so strict of course, for even in these days there are believers from the Jews and they therefore also form part of the Church and thus already have a share in that New Covenant. The order is, however: first the ten tribes and then the two. The ten tribes were plucked up out of the land, but that by no means means that God lost sight of them. He has rather blessed them more strongly. Also in earthly things. The history of the Jewish people is on the other hand rather miserable. It is the history of a little people that was sent into captivity, with all the misery that entails. The destruction of Jerusalem included. Afterwards a part of that little people returned of its own accord to the land, only to undergo the same thing again in the land. Again the Gentiles over them and again the destruction of Jerusalem. What misery. And that only because to Judah the kingship had been promised and therefore the Messiah had to come forth

from Judah, at least after the flesh. After that had happened they also rejected the Messiah and could depart again into captivity. In that respect the ten tribes are a good deal better off. That also stands in many places in the Old Testament. Moreover, it also says that the two tribes have sinned more than the ten. The ten tribes have admittedly lost their identity, but they have not been persecuted and neither have they been tempted by Satan. They had completely withdrawn from the picture of the people of God. They were not persecuted because in one way or another they were the chosen people of God. People had simply forgotten it. But afterwards it appears that God uses precisely that people for His purpose in our present dispensation. That is all attached to the name Joseph or to the name Ephraim.

1 Kings 11

Up to now we have occupied ourselves with the promises as they have been made to Israel from the beginning. They began with Abraham and were repeated to Isaac and Jacob and subsequently to Ephraim and Joseph. Remarkably enough in that order. I hope that you have seen with me that these promises concerning “a multitude of nations” and moreover concerning “many kings” have certainly not been fulfilled in the biblical history of the two or the ten tribes. In the Bible we more or less lose track of the largest part of Israel, namely of the ten tribes. It is apparently so that the promises are also not fulfilled to the two tribes of Israel. So what remains is that they apply to the ten tribes. That also explains why these promises to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are subsequently described and confirmed even more extensively to Joseph and Ephraim. Ephraim, who even passes for the firstborn among the tribes of Israel. That is remarkable because Ephraim is reckoned among the tribes of Israel, but strictly speaking is the thirteenth tribe, while we always know only twelve. There is therefore something special about that.

I now try to show you something about the history of the division of the people of Israel into the two and the ten tribes. Those terms as such are completely unbiblical. Not in their meaning, but they are not used in the Bible. Otherwise I must speak about Judah and Israel, or about Judah and Joseph, or about Judah and Ephraim. For there are different names that are used for that. These names, Israel, Joseph and Ephraim, however, do not always refer to the ten tribes. It depends on where they are used. The Bible therefore actually has no fixed expression for it. The expressions that are used receive their meaning in the context in which they are mentioned and there is nothing difficult about that. I am always glad about that because one can then use those expressions only in their biblical context. Outside that they lose their meaning. So we are obliged to read those terms in the Scripture where they are used. Where Judah and Ephraim stand over against each other we then immediately know that it is about the two and the ten tribes.

Solomon

In 1 Kings 11 we have come to the end of the history of King Solomon. It is announced here that after Solomon the kingdom would be divided into what we then know as the two and the ten tribes of Israel. That happens more or less as a punishment. At least, that is how it is announced. Solomon did not only occupy himself with the service to Jehovah. He built the temple for example. Solomon served the LORD. But besides that he also served all kinds of other gods.

1 Kings 11:6-11

6 And Solomon did evil in the sight of the LORD, and went not fully after the LORD, as did David his father.

7 Then did Solomon build an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon.

8 And likewise did he for all his strange wives, which burnt incense and sacrificed unto their gods.

9 And the LORD was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the LORD God of Israel, which had appeared unto him twice,

10 And had commanded him concerning this thing, that he should not go after other gods: but he kept not that which the LORD commanded.

11 Wherefore the LORD said unto Solomon, Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee, and will give it to thy servant.

The thought is that the whole kingdom of Solomon would be taken away and given to his servant. That servant we get to know a few verses further on under the name Jeroboam. Thereby the whole kingdom of the house of David would therefore also be taken away, for that is what it comes down to in practice. That runs into a technical difficulty. The firstborn, the head of the tribe of Judah, remains automatically, by definition, in any case king over Judah. So it is difficult to take all twelve tribes away from the house of David and therefore from Judah. What can happen is that eleven tribes would be taken away from the house of David and therefore from Judah, so that the firstborn of the house of Judah would indeed remain king over Judah. So in fact eleven tribes would be taken away from the house of Judah. But that is not stated literally. It is a conclusion that I draw and I can easily do that because that is also confirmed further on in this chapter. But the thought is that the whole kingdom would be taken away from the house of David and therefore from Judah. If Judah then remains, the thought is, that the kingdom would then be with the other eleven tribes and that Judah would stand beside it. It is taken away from Judah more or less as a punishment. It would be given to his servant.

1 Kings 11:26

26 And Jeroboam the son of Nebat, an Ephrathite of Zereda, Solomon's servant, whose mother's name was Zeruah, a widow woman, even he lifted up his hand against the king.

That was in accordance with the will of God. All Israel would be taken from him. God would therefore rise up against Solomon and his house. Jeroboam also lifted up his hand against the king.

1 Kings 11:27-28

27 And this was the cause that he lifted up his hand against the king: Solomon built Millo, and repaired the breaches of the city of David his father.

28 And the man Jeroboam was a mighty man of valour: and Solomon seeing the young man that he was industrious, he made him ruler over all the charge of the house of Joseph.

He made him ruler over all the charge of the house of Joseph. Solomon represented Judah and Jeroboam represented Joseph. So you already have the two over against each

other here, as we later find them over against each other again and again in the prophecies. Then we now go back to the history.

1 Kings 11:12-13

12 Notwithstanding in thy days I will not do it, for David thy father's sake: but I will rend it out of the hand of thy son.

13 Howbeit I will not rend away all the kingdom; but will give one tribe to thy son for David my servant's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake which I have chosen.

Actually it should have happened in the days of Solomon as a kind of measure against Solomon, but for David's sake it does not happen in his days, but in the days of Solomon's son. That son proves to be Rehoboam. He becomes king over Judah because the other tribes are taken from him. One tribe will remain to the house of David. That is not Judah, for Judah remained anyway with David. If the head of the tribe of Judah is king, then he automatically remains king over Judah. So that son therefore receives in total two tribes, namely Judah and Benjamin. That is not my conclusion, but that stands further on in this chapter.

1 Kings 11:29-31

29 And it came to pass at that time when Jeroboam went out of Jerusalem, that the prophet Ahijah the Shilonite found him in the way; and he had clad himself with a new garment; and they two were alone in the field:

30 And Ahijah caught the new garment that was on him, and rent it in twelve pieces:

31 And he said to Jeroboam, Take thee ten pieces: for thus saith the LORD, the God of Israel, Behold, I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee:

It would be torn from the hand of Solomon and therefore from Judah and given to Jeroboam and therefore to Joseph, to the ten tribes.

1 Kings 11:32

32 (But he shall have one tribe for my servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel:)

Verse 32 of course connects with verse 13. The tribe that is mentioned in verse 13 is naturally the same as the tribe in verse 32. That is the tribe of Benjamin. That cannot be missed. The two tribes after all consist of Judah and Benjamin. Further it says that it is for "my servant David's sake and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel." Jerusalem lies on the territory of Benjamin. Those borders are of course very difficult to trace, also from the Bible. Jerusalem admittedly lies in the midst of the territory of Judah, but the territory of Benjamin that lies a bit more to the south stretches with a narrow strip into the territory of Judah, up to and including Jerusalem. It is even claimed that it goes exactly up to and including the Temple Mount. It is a bit comparable with the situation we have known for decades around Berlin. It belonged to West Germany, but was completely surrounded by East Germany. There was only one route by which one could reach Berlin. From the territory of Benjamin there was a narrow strip that stretched from Benjamin up to and including Jerusalem, so that Jerusalem and the temple were admittedly considered as belonging to Judah, but lay on the territory of Benjamin. That is remarkable enough, because the kingdom of David and of Judah was established in Jerusalem. Moreover the temple was built by the son of David, Solomon, also from Judah. Jerusalem, like Bethlehem incidentally, is also indicated as the city of David. That is therefore Judah. Nevertheless it lay on the territory

of Benjamin. Benjamin was really more family of Joseph than of Judah. They were both from the same father, but Benjamin was from the same mother as Joseph. One can therefore actually say that when the tribe of Benjamin is added to the house of David, Benjamin in fact represents Joseph with Judah. The kingdom is split into two and ten tribes, into Judah and Joseph, but with Judah you find an important part of Joseph, namely Benjamin. The closest family of Joseph. Think also of the history of Joseph in Genesis. There Benjamin also plays such an important role and the connection between Joseph and Benjamin is emphasised there in a fivefold way. The reason for that tearing of the kingdom follows in verse 33.

1 Kings 11:33-34

33 Because that they have forsaken me, and have worshipped Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians, Chemosh the god of the Moabites, and Milcom the god of the children of Ammon, and have not walked in my ways, to do that which is right in mine eyes, and to keep my statutes and my judgments, as did David his father.

34 Howbeit I will not take the whole kingdom out of his hand: but I will make him prince all the days of his life for David my servant's sake, whom I chose, because he kept my commandments and my statutes:

It is not taken from Solomon himself. For David's sake the LORD leaves the kingdom to Solomon. But when it is taken from his son Rehoboam after the death of Solomon that is not a measure against Rehoboam, but against Solomon.

1 Kings 11:35

35 But I will take the kingdom out of his son's hand, and will give it unto thee, even ten tribes.

It does not say that the LORD will take a part of the kingdom, although that was in principle so. The thought is much stronger. He would take the kingdom out of the hand of his son. If we had not read any further we could conclude that all twelve tribes are taken from Solomon and that Jeroboam receives ten tribes of them. From the context it appears, however, that the other two tribes remain with Judah.

1 Kings 11:36

36 And unto his son will I give one tribe, that David my servant may have a light alway before me in Jerusalem, the city which I have chosen me to put my name there.

That is the third time it stands there. It is not thought of David personally, but of Judah. Judah would always have a lamp before the face of the LORD in Jerusalem. That lamp is Benjamin. Benjamin functions as a lamp for Judah. The LORD wants to put His name in Jerusalem. That does not come about through Judah, but because Benjamin represents Joseph in Judah. The LORD therefore puts His name in Jerusalem through Joseph, via Benjamin.

1 Kings 11:37

37 And I will take thee, and thou shalt reign according to all that thy soul desireth, and shalt be king over Israel.

Not over the ten tribes, but over Israel. They were of course the ten tribes, but it says Israel. The ten tribes are therefore indicated as Israel. What Jeroboam does not receive is then called Judah.

1 Kings 11:38

And it shall be, if thou wilt hearken unto all that I command thee, and wilt walk in

my ways, and do that which is right in mine eyes, to keep my statutes and my commandments, as David my servant did; that I will be with thee, and build thee a sure house, as I built for David, and will give Israel unto thee.”

“And will give Israel unto thee”! Israel is given. It was only the ten tribes, yet it is called Israel. There is more to this verse than meets the eye. Both to David and to Joseph a sure house is promised on the condition of faithfulness to the LORD. A sure house for David presents no difficulty; it ultimately comes to pass through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Lion of the tribe of Judah.

But what about the sure house of Joseph? In practice, the house of Jeroboam did not lead to much good. It eventually resulted in the deportation of the ten tribes of Israel – the deportation of Israel, in other words. Does that mean there is no sure house because Israel was unwilling? The same question can be asked about the kingdom of Judah. Does no kingdom come because Judah was unwilling? Certainly it does, for Paul says in the Epistle to the Romans: Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? In other words: Shall their unfaithfulness nullify the faithfulness of God? In Romans 3 it is stated that, despite the unbelief of Judah, that kingdom nevertheless comes into being. God always keeps His promises. He is not hindered by unbelievers from fulfilling His will.

Yet here in 1 Kings 11 we read of a royal house under the name “Joseph”, linked with the ten tribes of Israel. The ten tribes were unbelieving and were carried away into Assyrian captivity. That unbelief could not, of course, nullify the faithfulness of God – for, as Paul says, let God be true and every man a liar. He simply does what He has promised. We may therefore conclude that God has built (or will build) a sure house for Joseph as well – at the latest at the coming of the Messiah. This brings us very close to the right conclusion. That sure house has not been built in the past or up to the present in Judah, but it certainly will be in the future. No, this is not about the unshakeable throne of God in heaven. I am speaking of an unshakeable kingdom in the midst of the tribes of Israel. It will come to Judah – Scripture expressly teaches that – but only after the seventieth week of Daniel and only for believers. The same applies to the unshakeable throne over the ten tribes: only believers are involved.

We are speaking here of an unshakeable kingdom. As far as the two tribes are concerned, these are the promises made to David, which are not found in this particular passage. Here the promises concern Solomon and Jeroboam, and the ten tribes separately. The idea is that these things are being fulfilled in our own days: the sure house that God would build, not in Judah, but in Israel. That is undoubtedly the sure house of which we, by grace and through faith, form part. Judah is certainly not that house! That people is unbelieving in the biblical sense of the word. They know, but they reject. They have heard the message; it has been preached to them, but they simply will not accept it. That is unbelief.

So the house of which we form part – the house in which we are built as living stones upon the foundation, with Christ as the chief cornerstone – is Joseph. Here we see the two sides of the kingdom. There would be a kingdom in Judah and a kingdom in Joseph. If the kingdom of which we are part is not Judah, then it is natural to conclude that it is the kingdom of Joseph. I might also point out that the first man who plays a significant role in the New Testament is named Joseph – not the first one mentioned (that was Christ), but the first whose history is recorded.

The promises made in verse 38 are the same as those given to David in 2 Samuel 7. The ten tribes given to Jeroboam are therefore called Israel. It is the promise of a sure kingdom, of course on the basis of faith.

1 Kings 11:39

“And I will for this afflict the seed of David, but not for ever.”

“Afflict” simply means to humble. To humble is not necessarily done by force; it can happen in other ways. Humbling can mean that one humbles oneself. Judah will be humbled, while Joseph – and therefore Israel – will be exalted.

1 Kings 11:40

“Solomon sought therefore to kill Jeroboam. And Jeroboam arose, and fled into Egypt, unto Shishak king of Egypt, and was in Egypt until the death of Solomon.”

The result was that Solomon tried to kill Jeroboam. For God had called Israel (the ten tribes, Jeroboam, and thus Joseph) to provoke Judah to jealousy. That is a New Testament expression, and it is precisely what happens here. Solomon, who represents Judah, becomes jealous of Jeroboam, to whom Israel had been promised and who was to be exalted. That is exactly the effect later quoted in Isaiah and especially in the Epistle to the Romans. We usually say that it is the Church that will provoke the Jewish people to jealousy. If it is the ten tribes who provoke the two tribes to jealousy, and it is the Church who provokes the two to jealousy, then there is clearly a close connection between the ten tribes and the Church.

Jeroboam fled to Egypt, after which the son was called out of Egypt. That is Hosea and Matthew 2. Joseph and the Lord Jesus were called out of Egypt. The same thing happens. King Herod, officially the king of the Jews, tried to kill the born King of the Jews in Bethlehem. But Joseph, the legal father of the Lord Jesus, received a dream. A Joseph in the Bible is meant to dream. Then God speaks only through dreams, because it always concerns the mysteries of the kingdom. Joseph is told in a dream to flee to Egypt, and he takes the Lord Jesus with him. Two years later he returns, and it is stated that this fulfils the prophecy in Hosea: “Out of Egypt have I called my son.”

At best that is only half the fulfilment of the prophecy, for it would be applied several times. This is illustrated in 1 Kings 11. Jeroboam has to flee from Solomon, from whose kingdom it will be taken away. After the death of Solomon (corresponding to the death of Herod), Jeroboam returns from Egypt to take the kingdom of Israel – not the two tribes, but the ten. And when the Lord Jesus (the ultimate Son) comes out of Egypt, we read that they had intended to settle in Bethlehem, but the Lord said they must go to Nazareth. Nazareth belonged from ancient times to the territory of the ten tribes. When Jeroboam comes out of Egypt he does not become king over the two tribes, but over the ten. If the ultimate Jeroboam, the true Joseph, appears and becomes King, then – following this line – He will not be King over the Jews, but over the ten tribes.

Uninspired history shows that within a very short time – within four years of the resurrection of Christ – the gospel reached Britain. That land is considered to be the land of Ephraim, the centre of the ten tribes of Israel, the isles of the sea. It was the first country officially declared a Christian nation. The gospel was rejected by the Jews and accepted by the Britons, and thus passed from the two tribes to the ten. I do not conclude this from Scripture alone; history expressly confirms these things.

The Lord Jesus had to flee to Egypt, just as Jeroboam the son of Joseph did. Afterwards Jeroboam returned to take rule over the ten tribes. And the Lord Jesus returned from Egypt to settle, not in Bethlehem and thus in Judea, but in Galilee, from ancient times

the territory of the ten tribes of Israel. “Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?” “Can there any good thing come out of Joseph?” “Can there any good thing come out of the ten tribes?” Yes – there are promises enough. They go around Judah.

1 Kings 12

The next section in 1 Kings 11 speaks of the death of Solomon. Then Rehoboam the son of Solomon went to Shechem, for all Israel had come there to make him king. But Shechem is a city of Ephraim, so it does not all work out. The history of Dinah and the Shechemites tells the same story. Shechem, Samaria; John 4, the Samaritan woman; the woman (Dinah) from Shechem, Sychar. In John 4 it is established that the Jews do not believe, but the Samaritans do. It even says that “salvation is of the Jews.” That is ambiguous. It can mean that salvation comes through the Jews, but it can also mean that salvation would be taken from the Jews and given – in that context – to Samaria. If it goes from Jerusalem to Samaria, it goes from the two tribes to the ten, for Samaria was once the capital of the ten tribes of Israel.

Something goes wrong. There is talk of a third day. That is to say, no decision is taken about who will be king. They would wait until the third day. That third day obviously speaks of the resurrection of Christ. The death of Solomon actually corresponds with the death of the Lord Jesus and thus with the end of the Old Covenant. Then the promises must be fulfilled. So how should it proceed? What does the will say? The kingdom of Israel would be given to Joseph and taken away from Judah, from Solomon. Solomon dies, the Lord Jesus dies, and then they must wait until the third day and come to Him, and then it will be decided how things will go. It turns out that the kingdom does not go to Rehoboam (except for the two tribes), but to Jeroboam.

Where did the kingdom of Christ go after His resurrection? Not to Judah and Benjamin, but to Joseph and the ten tribes. It went to Jerusalem, but there persecution broke out. The church in Jerusalem was persecuted, mistreated, killed and scattered. But then it immediately went to Samaria. That was exactly in accordance with what was already said in Acts 1. The disciples asked whether the Lord Jesus would at that time restore the kingdom to Israel. But what is Israel? The Lord said: “It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.” It is not only a matter of time, but also of circumstances. Israel (the Jews) would not come to faith. Instead the kingdom would remain hidden, and in that time the Church would be built. That is the times. Now the circumstances. The kingdom would indeed be established for Israel, though it would remain hidden, but that did not apply to the Jews. And so the Lord said:

Acts 1:7-8

“It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.”

Receiving the Holy Spirit belongs to the coming of the kingdom. They will be His witnesses, beginning at Jerusalem, then in Samaria, and then to the uttermost part of the earth. What one understands by that does not matter so much, for it can also mean the ten tribes. That expression is already used for them in the Old Testament. But it can also mean all Gentiles. And in practice we know what happened: it was preached to all Gentiles, and some of them believed. 1 Kings 12:16

“So when all Israel saw that the king hearkened not unto them, the people answered the

king, saying, What portion have we in David? neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse: to your tents, O Israel: now see to thine own house, David. So Israel departed unto their tents.”

The people said to Rehoboam, “David, you can sort it out yourself.” It was Rehoboam, but that does not matter further. He is addressed under the name of his ancestor, the founder of his dynasty. Israel said, “What have we to do with David?” That is not so strange, for if one were to base oneself on the old promises to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and Ephraim, one would indeed not end up with Judah but with Jeroboam. To him the promises had been made. All Israel therefore went to their tents, and with that Judah was finished. All Israel!

1 Kings 12:17

“But as for the children of Israel which dwelt in the cities of Judah, Rehoboam reigned over them.”

There were some from the ten tribes who lived in the cities of Judah. Over them Rehoboam did reign. So Rehoboam reigned over Judah, but also over a part of Israel that had settled in the midst of Judah. Thus Israel is indeed represented among the two tribes, but no more than that. One can of course never say that Israel formed part of Judah. Israel goes its own way, so that Judah stands outside Israel – not the other way round! Our problem is that we almost automatically use the term “Israel” to mean the Jews, whereas the situation in the Bible – and certainly in the Old Testament – is the opposite. Judah stands outside Israel. But when Israel disappears and loses its identity in captivity, and to some extent even forgets the name, then the name Israel remains. Where else can one then apply it but to the survivors of the family, the Jewish people? But that is not the primary heir of the title. Israel is either all twelve tribes or the ten, with Joseph at their head. Only in the last resort, when the others are no longer there, can Judah lay claim to that name. The ten tribes, however, are somewhere. We have the promise that they will be gathered again at the revelation of the kingdom. Judah has therefore been using the name “Israel” all this time unjustly.

1 Kings 12:18

“Then king Rehoboam sent Adoram, who was over the tribute; and all Israel stoned him with stones, that he died. Therefore king Rehoboam made speed to get him up to his chariot, to flee to Jerusalem.”

Rehoboam sends Adoram, and all Israel (the ten tribes) stoned him. They tried in vain to subdue the ten tribes after all.

1 Kings 12:19

“So Israel rebelled against the house of David unto this day.”

It is unknown which day that was, because we do not know who wrote this, but it was evidently written long afterwards. That is clear from the expression, or the expression was added long afterwards. In our own days the situation is still the same, although in the line we are now following the roles are actually reversed. For the thought now is that the ten tribes have come to acceptance of the King of Israel from the house of David, while the two tribes have rejected their own King from their own house of Judah. I say this with all due reservation. I am of course speaking of the phenomenon I have brought forward so often: that the majority of believers in our days descend from the ten tribes of Israel – most from the ten, then a minority from the two, and then an even smaller minority from the rest of the world’s population. The majority is Anglo-Saxon. The next part is Jewish. There are certainly quite a few Jews who have come to faith in the Lord

Jesus Christ. But as for the other Gentile peoples, they are only individuals. It does not say that it had to be so, but it is simply a statement of fact. One can even reverse the argument. Since the majority of believers consist of Anglo-Saxons or from that population group, one can hardly draw any other conclusion than that the Anglo-Saxons are the heirs of the ten tribes of Israel. That, incidentally, is the most commonly heard argument.

The name Israel therefore expressly goes with the ten tribes. And so it remains, for afterwards throughout the whole Bible – and certainly in the Old Testament – that distinction is made: Judah over against Israel. When the New Covenant is announced in Jeremiah 31, it is said that it will be made with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah – even in that order. If one holds to the application of those terms and then reads in the New Testament about Israel, one reads for the word Israel: the ten tribes. That is at least suggested.

The Name Joseph in Scripture

Scripture uses certain words and names to establish connections and point us to other passages. When the New Testament therefore opens with a Joseph, one must immediately ask: Who is Joseph? What is the significance of Joseph? That leads us straight to Genesis. Of course it is a different Joseph, yet it is nonetheless a very clear reference.

When Paul sets out on his missionary journeys and things do not go well, a certain Joseph appears. We know him afterwards as Barnabas, but his real name was Joseph. Paul takes him along and puts him to work. Then he disappears from the scene again. The earthly life of the Lord Jesus begins with Joseph. His public ministry also involves a Joseph. When He rises from the dead, it begins once more with a Joseph. He rises from the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. He is regarded as the gardener of the garden belonging to Joseph of Arimathea.

When the number of disciples must later be completed because Judas is gone and only eleven remain, there is one candidate: Joseph. Judas was to be replaced by Joseph, but it does not happen. Matthias is chosen instead, and Joseph remains in the background as what I would call a thirteenth apostle. He is not that, for if there is a thirteenth it is Paul. When Paul later appears, a Joseph appears first – the one called Barnabas. He helps Paul on his way, and later, when Barnabas is in Antioch, he specifically fetches Paul from Tarsus to take him with him to Antioch. Afterwards Barnabas leaves because Paul can manage on his own. All these sections of New Testament history are introduced with a Joseph. That can hardly be coincidence. Moreover, in many cases the name Joseph need not even have been mentioned, since Joseph was simply called Barnabas and the other Barsabbas. These names could easily have been omitted.

Of Benjamin it is said that he would be a light, apparently for Joseph, because he was the brother of Joseph who stood with Judah. This presupposes that if Judah ever comes to conversion, it will be through the light of Joseph. Who then comes to faith first – Joseph or Judah? If Joseph is to be the light for Judah, then Joseph must come to faith first. And when the gospel is preached to the Jews in our days, it is preached by the Church, but in the biblical picture by Joseph. That is even literally true. It is simply a fact that the English, and later the Americans, were the pioneers of mission work among the Jews. What is more, the church in Rome itself stood under protection and was probably founded by the British royal house of that time. Some members of that British royal

house are mentioned in the Bible. Linus and Gladys were members of the royal family. In Scripture they are called Linus and Claudia. Their identity is not stated, but uninspired history tells us very clearly who they were.

If the use of uninspired history goes too far for you, I must point out that the book of Daniel cannot otherwise be explained, for it is only from uninspired history that we know which kingdoms are referred to in Daniel 2. The same applies to Daniel 11, which concerns kings of the north and of the south. Only with the help of uninspired history can the line be properly followed. In those same prophecies, both here and in the New Testament, an important role is played by one Antiochus Epiphanes. We know him only from uninspired history. Without him those prophecies would simply remain unfulfilled. When John speaks of the feast of the dedication of the temple, which feast is he referring to? That feast is not mentioned in Leviticus 23 or anywhere else in Scripture. That it was the feast of the rededication of the temple after it had been defiled in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes can only be explained from uninspired history.

The British have understood this well. They say: history is His story. What we know of ancient history we know only because it connects with the Bible. It has been preserved so that we might make the connections. The same applies when Paul sends greetings to people we do not know. Why is that in the Bible? Because those figures provide the link with uninspired history. They form the beginning of church history. History does not stop at the end of Acts or at the end of Paul's letters. It simply continues. The connection is made through the names that are mentioned. This is not new, for it already happened in the Old Testament.¹³

Hosea and Romans

In Hosea the focus is specifically on the ten tribes. In the end they do bear fruit. The remarkable way in which this happens is explained in the Epistle to the Romans. Hosea was a prophet in the midst of the ten tribes. That is why the names Israel and Ephraim are used. With a view to the future, the next question should be why those names are used. These are prophecies that do not concern the twelve tribes but the ten, and the ten tribes and Ephraim are referred to as an olive tree – even as one that bears no fruit. The Epistle to the Romans then explains how the grafting works.

In Hosea the matter concerns “Lo-ammi”, which would yet become “Ammi”. The basic idea is that God's people, who were “Ammi”, would become “Lo-ammi”, but would nevertheless become “Ammi” again. It is a prophecy concerning Israel. The interesting thing is that both Paul and Peter quote this prophecy and apply it to believers from the Gentiles. At any rate Paul does so. With Peter it is always open to discussion. “Lo-ammi” becomes “Ammi”, and Paul applies it to the Gentiles.

Romans 9:20-26

“Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not

beloved. And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them,
Ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God.”

Paul is simply saying here that “Lo-ammi” can become “Ammi”, that Gentiles can come to faith and be added to the people of God. But why does he specifically mention that it is written in Hosea? So that we would look it up in Hosea, for Hosea shows that it concerns something different from what Paul appears to say. In Hosea it is clear that “Lo-ammi” must be understood as “Ammi” that has become “Lo-ammi”. In other words, Israel, the people of God, whom God has cast off, set aside, or carried away into captivity. Nevertheless they will yet become “Ammi” again. This does not concern Gentiles, but exclusively Israel. Yet Paul says it concerns Gentiles. He is therefore not speaking of Gentiles in general, but of those Gentiles who descend from the ten tribes of Israel – who truly were “Lo-ammi” but had not always been so. The other Gentiles had always been “Lo-ammi”.

Why is it not stated more clearly? Because that would create the misunderstanding that salvation is intended only for the two and the ten tribes of Israel, and that is not the case. For us as believers it is stated clearly enough for us to draw that conclusion. It makes no difference to our salvation. But it does explain a great deal. Personally I am firmly convinced that the apostle knew exactly what he was talking about. He chose his words very precisely in order to say it as ambiguously as possible. He simply speaks of Jews and Gentiles, but he is thinking of the Jews and the ten tribes.

That is the case in Romans 9 and 11, and also when he says that God has not cast away His people, for he, Paul, is proof of it. He is of the seed of Benjamin. Notice that the name Judah is expressly avoided. He speaks of Israel, of Benjamin, of “an Hebrew of the Hebrews”. He does not do that here, but he does in Philippians 3. There he says the same thing. He does not call himself a Jew, although we all think he was a Jew. And of course that is what it means. But he avoids the term because he is making the connection with Joseph and not with Judah.

This also appears from the words of:

Romans 10:19-21

“But I say, Did not Israel know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you. But Esaias is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me. But to Israel he saith, All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.”

It is difficult to keep a clear line in this passage. “Did not Israel know?” This rhetorical question is not answered. Quotations are given from the Old Testament. But how are these quotations an answer to that question? Moses says: “I will provoke you to jealousy by Lo-ammi. By a foolish nation I will anger you.” Just as Solomon was provoked to anger by Jeroboam. Just as Judah was provoked to anger against Joseph. That was already said by Moses in Deuteronomy 32:21. Who is that people? In Hosea the term appears. It is Israel whom the Lord has let go – an unbelieving Israel. If it nevertheless comes to the Lord, it becomes “Ammi” again.

For convenience we always say that “Lo-ammi” is the Church. The explanation is then that the Jews are provoked to jealousy by the Church, and in simplified form that is indeed what it amounts to. But has Israel understood? That is the question that needed answering. They have not understood. But “Lo-ammi”, which would provoke Israel to jealousy, has understood. The question whether Israel has understood or not cannot

simply be answered with yes or no. One part of Israel has not understood, but the other part certainly has. Paul gives no direct answer here, but he does give hints. According to Hosea, “Lo-ammi” was first “Ammi”. That must be Israel, for “you” refers to the Jewish people. The wise nation is the Jewish people.

Romans 2:17-20

“Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, And knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law; And art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, An instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law.”

The Jews regarded themselves as the wise people. That is what Paul establishes, and he himself belonged to that wise people. In verse 19 they see themselves as “a light of them which are in darkness”. But they themselves were in darkness, and the light was Benjamin. If the Jews are the wise people, then it is natural that the ten tribes are the foolish people – those who served idols and were eventually carried away into captivity. Paul says that Isaiah was very bold and courageous in what he dared to say. Paul says that because he had to say the same thing, but found it rather difficult to say that salvation would be taken from the Jews and given to another people.

Gentiles in general could not seek the LORD and could not ask after Him, for they did not even know His name. It must therefore have been a people that in some way knew God – a people that could call upon God. The Jews did call upon His name, but they did not know Him. But the foolish people, those who asked not after Him, have found Him. To them apply the words: “How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!” (Romans 10:15; Isaiah 52:7; Nahum 1:15). Those feet have indeed gone from the two tribes to the ten tribes.

Mary, whichever Mary one means, is always a picture of the ten tribes. Mary anointed with oil in the house of Lazarus, in the midst of that company which was the first – four years after the resurrection of Christ – to be in Britain, on the island of Avalon, present-day Glastonbury. Joseph of Arimathaea, Lazarus, Mary, Martha are called in uninspired history “the group from Bethany”. It was not Martha but Mary who anointed the feet of the Lord Jesus, for Martha, the servant, is a picture of the two tribes living under the law – always busy serving. But Mary never did anything. She simply listened to the Word. She is a picture of believers from the ten tribes. That is why the mother of the Lord Jesus is called Mary. And the father is called Joseph. And when Mary of Bethany sits at the feet of the Lord Jesus, Jesus says, “Mary hath chosen that good part.” That is the only part that is needed, and what Martha did was not needed at all.

That is why it was also a Mary who was the first to meet the Lord when He rose from the dead. She thought He was the gardener, the gardener of Joseph of Arimathaea. In that way He is again the Son of Joseph. Mary was not allowed to touch the Lord, for He had not yet ascended. The figurative explanation is that Mary is indeed a picture of the ten tribes to whom the gospel would be brought. They would recognise Him, but they would not touch Him. That is the present position of the ten tribes. Then I have come full circle, for I had also arrived at the present position of the ten tribes on the basis of Hosea. Gomer, the wife of Hosea, whom he bought back at the slave market, remained with him for a long time without them touching each other. They belonged to each other and formed a unity; she was his property, but they did not touch. Officially no union, but in practice they certainly bore fruit.

In Romans 10, therefore, statements of Moses and Isaiah are quoted and applied to the present situation. They are applied to a Gentile people, the Church. By that Gentile people the two tribes were provoked to jealousy. That is still the case today. Jewish persecution of Christians was certainly invented by the Jews. After which the Jews will say that the persecution of Jews was invented by the Christians. But that is not true, for it was the Romans. In saying this I am not excusing history, but only indicating where it began. That is jealousy. It leads to hatred, to murder and slaughter. And that is what this is about.

It appears that the promises to Joseph are fulfilled in the Church of our days. That is why the rise of the Church and the preaching of church truth (also to the Jews) takes place through Benjamin, that is Paul, the lamp in Judah. Afterwards Benjamin joins himself to Joseph, for that is where he belongs. When the Jews reject the preaching, Benjamin (Paul) disappears and through Rome he then ends up in Britain.

Ezekiel 37

The well-known prophecy about the valley of dry bones is found in this passage. "Can these bones live?" As I say that, I think of the end of the book of Genesis, where the bones of Joseph are laid in Egypt. That is the end of the story and even the end of the whole book of the Bible. "They laid his bones in a coffin in Egypt." Can these bones live? Joseph was embalmed, later taken along at the exodus from Egypt, and eventually buried in Canaan at Shechem, the very place where the Samaritan woman later sat at the well and met the Lord.

Ezekiel says, "O Lord GOD, thou knowest." In Ezekiel the bones that are seen represent the whole house of Israel.

Ezekiel 37:11-13

"Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel: behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off for our parts. Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the LORD, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves."

The people were considered dead, but they will one day be made alive again. This is not about the individual but about the people. When Israel dies, it does not mean there are no more Israelites, but that the people as a nation have gone down and disappeared among the Gentiles. They will only be made alive again in the way described here. This is roughly the end of the first prophecy. The second part begins at verse 15.

Ezekiel 37:15-16

"The word of the LORD came again unto me, saying, Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions."

Ezekiel must take two sticks. One with the name Judah, representing the two tribes of Israel, and on the other the name Joseph, or the name Ephraim, representing the ten tribes of Israel.

Ezekiel 37:17

“And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand.”

These two sticks will become one. They will, as it were, grow together in the hand of the prophet. This means that one day the two tribes and the ten tribes will be joined together again and made into one people. This is also stated in the rest of the chapter.

Ezekiel 37:19-21

“Say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand. And the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thine hand before their eyes. And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land.”

“I will cause you to come up out of your graves, O my people.” God will take the children of Israel from among the heathen. In practice this is the same thing.

Ezekiel 37:22-23

“And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all: Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwelling

places, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God.”

All that will henceforth be counted as loss and dung, said Paul of Benjamin. This is not so much about idolatry in general, but about the situation of the Jewish people under the law. Paul uses the term “dung” for it. In the end they will be God’s “Ammi” and He will be their God. That was already in Hosea.

Ezekiel 37:24

“And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them.”

David here stands for the Heir of David, the Lord Jesus Christ. There were two kingdoms and two peoples, but they will have one King and one Shepherd.

Ezekiel 37:25-26

“And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children’s children for ever: and my servant David shall be their prince for ever. Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore.”

The covenant of peace is the New Covenant, also called the bond of peace in Ephesians 4. It is an everlasting covenant. It is even the basis on which the eternal kingship of Christ will be established – an eternal kingdom on the basis of an eternal covenant.

Ezekiel 37:27-28

“And my tabernacle also shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they

shall be my people. And the heathen shall know that I the LORD do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore.”

We therefore find here a clear prophecy of the future restoration of Israel – all twelve tribes together. When Ezekiel is told to take the sticks in his hand, Judah is mentioned first and then Joseph. But when the meaning is explained, Joseph is mentioned first and then Judah. The order is reversed. In the days of the Lord Jesus, Judah comes first, but in our days the order is turned round. Now Ephraim comes first.

Superficially this is a prophecy about the final restoration of Israel, which will be joined together again and made into one people. That has not yet happened, although some claim it has. After all, Anna is there (Luke 2:36), so the rest must be there too and the ten tribes must now simply form part of the Jewish people again. That is of course nonsense, is the reasoning. In any case the Jews themselves state plainly in black and white that it is not so. The Jews consist of Judah and Benjamin and at most a little of the tribe of Levi. The ten tribes are completely lost. Whether they have the impression that they will one day be united again with the ten tribes I do not know. I have at least never heard or read any statement about it. They probably see themselves as Israel. It can hardly be a coincidence that the Jewish state is called Israel.

It is indeed a prophecy about the ultimate establishment of the kingdom on earth in the future, but that is actually the wrong conclusion, for nothing is said here about either a revealed kingdom or a hidden kingdom. In principle that distinction does not exist at all in the Old Testament. What is spoken of here is the New Covenant – an everlasting covenant and a covenant of peace. That is what it is about. And when does the New Covenant come into force? From the resurrection of Christ onwards. His death was the end of the Old Covenant and His resurrection was the beginning of the New Covenant, so the New Covenant has already come into operation. To remain truly in line with what this prophecy says, we should therefore look at the way in which this prophecy is being fulfilled at present. It then appears that the current fulfilment of this prophecy has not yet gone much further than the joining of Ephraim to Judah (verse 19). In any case Ephraim comes first. We are living in the days of the first part of the fulfilment of the promises connected with the New Covenant.

This prophecy is expressly quoted in at least two places in the New Testament. The New Testament writings in reality do not deal with the New Covenant in general. The revealed things of the New Covenant, the things of the public kingdom, the coming of the Messiah, the establishment of His kingdom, the deliverance of Israel from its enemies, the expansion of His kingdom over all nations – these are not the content of the New Testament writings. They may be referred to here and there, but that is not their subject. The content of the New Testament writings is that the once public kingdom is still hidden and will remain so until the return of Christ. The writers are all in one way or another occupied with what God is doing in our days while we wait for that kingdom. In all those books they speak in general about the days in which we live, right up to the return of Christ. What happens after that can simply be found again in the Old Testament. How those Old Testament things connect with the present church truths, with the days of our dispensation of the mystery, is set out in the book of Revelation.¹⁵

Ephesians 2

The most important quotation from Ezekiel 37 in the New Testament is the one in Ephesians 2. Paul is speaking here to believers.

Ephesians 2:11

“Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands.”

They are no longer Gentiles because they have come to faith in the God of Israel. The Gentiles are those who were called uncircumcision. This refers to the circumcision made with hands. This immediately pushes the circumcision into the background, for it was only done with hands.

Ephesians 2:12

“That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.”

They were without the Messiah of Israel. They have no future hope and are without God in the world. If this were about Gentiles in general it should really say “strangers to the commonwealth of Israel”. They never had any part in the commonwealth of Israel and therefore could not be alienated from it. But it clearly says “aliens from” – having become strangers to the commonwealth. Paul is therefore speaking about a particular kind of Gentiles. This is not about strange figures but about strangers, foreigners – strangers from the covenants of promise. The covenants of promise were made with Israel. Gentiles have no part in them. “Covenants” (plural) means there are at least two. One is the covenant with Abraham and the other with David. To David the kingship – an unshakeable throne – is promised on the basis of that new unshakeable covenant. That covenant rests on the promises to Abraham. If there is a covenant with David concerning the kingship, then the covenant with Abraham concerns the priesthood. It is veiled, it is hidden, but it can be found in the statements made to Abraham and in Abraham’s history, for example with Melchizedek.

Ephesians 2:13

“But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.”

“Being far off” is the Old Testament term for Gentiles. They are far off – preferably on the isles of the sea, the coastlands. Being near means having a share in the commonwealth of Israel. Although they were Gentiles they have received a part in the commonwealth of Israel and in the promises made to Israel. The blood of Christ is the life of Christ, for He is the living Christ.

Ephesians 2:14

“For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us.”

He is the peace of Jew and Gentile. He has made the two one. The explanation of the middle wall of partition is always that it is the separation between the court of the Jews and the court of the Gentiles. That is exactly the place where Paul was seized – in the gate between the court of the Gentiles and the court of the Jews, where he was accused of taking Gentiles inside the court of the Jews as though they were Jews. He had not actually done so, but they wanted to accuse him of something. It is therefore about the wall of separation between Jew and Gentile. And here it says that Christ has broken down that wall.

Ephesians 2:15-17

“Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments

contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.”

Notice the order. Something is not quite right, but I stubbornly read what Paul himself wrote – namely Gentiles over against Jews. But the term “Jew” is not even used. A number of things do not add up. Point 1: that these Gentiles should be alienated from the commonwealth of Israel. That means they must have had a part in it first. Point 2: that in verse 17 those who “were afar off” are mentioned first. The Gentiles are therefore placed first, or at least mentioned first.

Ephesians 2:18-20

“For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God; And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.”

Paul speaks of peace that has been made between Gentile and Jew – between Gentiles on the one hand and the two tribes of Israel on the other. Note carefully that he is expressly speaking about the Church, and therefore about believers from the Gentiles and believers from the two tribes of Israel. He does this under the mention of the New Covenant. In verses 15-17 he still calls it peace. He does this many times, which is a clear reference to the covenant of peace in Ezekiel. In Ephesians 4 the same unity is again in view, and there Paul calls that covenant of peace the bond of peace. Under that New Covenant we two – both, therefore – have been made one. The whole line of thought here is drawn from Ezekiel 37. The mention of the building is also a thought that occurs in that same passage. There it is called the temple or the tabernacle. What is said in Ezekiel 37 about Joseph and Judah is said here in Ephesians 2 about the Gentiles and Judah. And in Ezekiel 37 it is not about Joseph and Judah in general, but about believers from those two groups. No one enters the kingdom of Christ without being born again. This hardly needs to be added, because it is clear enough and because the unbelievers from the ten and the two tribes, as well as the unbelievers from all other Gentiles, will be cut off. For the kingdom is established on this earth and only believers enter that kingdom.

Paul therefore applies the statements about believers from Joseph and Judah, who would become one, to believers from the Gentiles and believers from Judah. There is not the slightest doubt that in the Church there is no difference between Jew and Gentile. Whoever one may be. Because we are one in Christ those distinctions no longer apply. In practice, therefore, it makes no difference. The apostle does speak about Gentiles, yet in the first place he clearly had in mind those Gentiles who descend from the ten tribes of Israel. That is why he can also say that they were alienated from the commonwealth of Israel. In doing so he suggests at the very least that those Gentiles had once had a part in that commonwealth. They were originally indeed “Ammi”, who only later became Gentiles and therefore “Lo-ammi”. Then he can with full right apply the statements from Ezekiel 37 in the way he does here. If I were to preach it, I would say that it is about Jew and Gentile who have become one in Christ. Exactly as it stands there. The account can also be readily understood even if we did not lay Ezekiel 37 alongside it. But the study of Scripture involves comparing Scripture with Scripture, and then we see that exactly the same thought is developed here as in Ezekiel 37. Here,

however, it is not about the revelation of the kingdom, but precisely about the mystery of the kingdom of heaven. If that mystery comes to the fore anywhere, it is on this page of the Bible. The account is also not told to the Jews. It is not that believers from the Gentiles are added to Judah, but the other way round. It proceeds from the Gentiles. It is said of the Gentiles what position they have received in Christ. And that is indeed a position together with believers from the Jews.

The thought behind it is that we must especially not think that the Church consists only of believers from the Gentiles and that the Jews are excluded from it. That remark is not superfluous. For throughout the centuries the so-called Christian church has always said that there is no hope for the Jews. That the Jew is the God-murderer and cannot be saved. Even now in evangelical circles in the Netherlands it is said that one should not bring the gospel to the Jews, for they are blinded anyway. That is God's will. God will sort it out Himself later. But that is not how it is at all – on the contrary. The position that we Gentiles – as believers – have received, we share with all other believers and especially with believers from Judah. That must at least be regarded as an application of the statements in Ezekiel 37. But the statements in Ezekiel 37 are not explicitly about Gentiles and Judah, but about Joseph and Judah. From this it can be concluded by typology that the majority of Gentiles who have received a part in the body of Christ originate from the ten tribes of Israel, from Joseph.

John 10

There is yet another Scripture passage drawn from Ezekiel 37. In John 10 it is even expressly stated that it is drawn from Ezekiel 37. This subject plays an important role in the twenty-one chapters of John's Gospel. That is easily explained. The two apostles were Peter and John. Peter is in any case a picture of believers from the Jews. Peter, who first rejected and denied the Messiah, just like Judas, but who afterwards, also three times, declared his love for the Lord. He is therefore a picture of believers from the Jews in our days. Of whom then would that mysterious John, who is never named by name in John's Gospel, be a picture? He must then be a picture of believers from the ten tribes of Israel. That is why they have no identity. It is a mystery. Although everyone knows who that apostle was whom Jesus loved, it is nowhere stated. So it is also with the Church. Although it is nowhere explicitly stated, everyone can know that the Church is the heir of Joseph – at least in our days.

In John 10 the Lord says among other things that He is the good Shepherd.

John 10:11

“I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.”

That does not mean that He dies for the sheep. For a shepherd can do the sheep no worse service than to die. It means that the good shepherd devotes his life to the sheep. He has been appointed for that.

John 10:12

“But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep.”

The hireling flees because he is only a hireling and has no care for the sheep. But the Lord is the good Shepherd, the real one. Just as He is the true Vine. If the Lord is the good Shepherd, who then is the shepherd? I always think then of David, who was a shepherd and eventually became king over all twelve tribes of Israel. Only after he had

tended that flock does he then tend the twelve tribes of Israel. That is successively the mysteries of the kingdom and the revelation of it. Jesus is the good Shepherd, the true David, the true Moses. He is the Prophet like Moses. He is the Son of David. He knows His own. He knows His sheep. And His sheep know Him also.

John 1:11

“He came unto his own, and his own received him not.”

His own did not know Him. Were they then His own? They did not know Him. But He says, “My sheep know me.” What is called “his own” here is the Jewish people. They did not know Him and therefore were not His own. For the Lord says, “If they are mine, then they know me and I know them.” All things considered, certainly in the context of John’s Gospel, that can actually never be the Jews. But who then?

John 10:14-15

“I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep.”

And then He says:

John 10:16

“And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd.”

The good Shepherd has yet more sheep. Other sheep, of the same kind, but not of this fold. This fold did not know Him. The Jews do not know Him and do not understand Him. They say, “We know not what he saith,” while He was simply speaking plain language. If this fold is Judah, then the other fold must be Joseph or Ephraim – the ten tribes, in other words. It cannot be the Church, for the Church is of a different kind from Judah, and also on a different level. Moreover Jesus says that He must bring those other sheep also. Of the Church one cannot say that they must be brought, for the Church consists precisely of those who have been brought. The intention is not that the gospel should be preached to the Church, for the Church consists of people who have believed the gospel. He cannot therefore say that He has preached the gospel to the Jews and that this must still happen to the Church. That cannot be. The other fold cannot be the Gentiles either. Those would then be sheep of a very different kind and nature.

There shall be one fold and one shepherd. That is after all the statement from Ezekiel 34 and especially from Ezekiel 37. There it is about two folds that would become one fold under one King. Notice that “King” is not mentioned here. That is understandable, for the Shepherd is first of all a picture of the High Priest and only in the second place of the King. Since under the New Covenant these things can hardly be separated, the difference is not really important. Nothing is said about a revealed kingdom. That is why He is called Shepherd here. That is the function of the Forerunner. For the Shepherd goes before the flock. And the Forerunner has gone in for us. That is the High Priest of the New Covenant. The ten tribes will also hear His voice and then there will be one fold.

John 10:24

“Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly.”

The Jews understood very well that the statements about the one Shepherd and the one fold were drawn from Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament. They had probably also noticed that He was quoting from Ezekiel 37.

John 10:25

“Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not: the works that I do in my Father’s name, they bear witness of me.”

It was clear enough. And if you were to ask me where it is plainly stated that the Church comes from the ten tribes of Israel, I would also say, “I have told you.” I found it clear enough. It is the only right conclusion, but you must draw it yourself.

It is the same with the Lord. It is clear enough, while one cannot find a single statement in which Jesus says that He is the Messiah.

John 10:26

“But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you.” That He says to the Jews of verse 24.

John 10:27-30

“My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand. I and my Father are one.”

When the Jews hear that, they become jealous, for they hear about another fold and about other sheep who do listen to Him. The Lord says that these are His sheep who listen to Him. The Jews are not; they rejected Him. He does not say who the other sheep actually are, but it is clear enough.

John 11

The story in John 11 immediately continues with the raising of Lazarus, the man who together with Joseph of Arimathaea was the first to arrive in Britain to preach the gospel there. That was at the invitation of the Britons themselves. Lazarus was the head of that household on the Mount of Olives outside Jerusalem. That is a picture of the Church: the kingdom outside Jerusalem. The Mount of Olives is the place where the Lord last set His feet and where He will in the future also continue the interrupted history. Then He will once more set His feet on the Mount of Olives. Lazarus is the head of the whole household on that Mount of Olives. He is therefore a picture of the Mediator of the New Covenant in our days – namely of Eleazar (Melchizedek, Christ), the High Priest of the New Covenant.

The interesting thing is of course that the whole household of the group from Bethany was put by the Jews into a ship to get rid of them. That was in the days of the first Christian persecutions in the year 36. They were put into a ship without rudder and without sail and therefore suffered shipwreck from the beginning, just like Paul.

Although Paul arrived in Malta, at the place of the man with the issue of blood, they arrived neatly in Marseille, in Gaul. There lived Gauls, descendants of the Celts, who are descendants of the ten tribes of Israel. There they met an embassy from the British royal house who invited them to come to Britain. They arrived there still in the same year and were welcomed by the British royal house, the famous Caractacus. In Celtic “Caradoc”. That was a legendary figure from uninspired history.

Lazarus died, but he was raised and later disappeared. He was never seen again on the Mount of Olives, for the man was in England.

The same applied to Joseph. He was sold and was never seen again. Nevertheless Judah later found him again – in England, if you understand what I mean. If you now want ready-made typology, then read in John 11, after the raising of Lazarus:

John 11:47-48

“Then gathered the chief priests and the Pharisees a council, and said, What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.”

This is therefore a verdict on the two tribes. They had seen it correctly, for that is exactly what would happen. They could not stop Him. The Lord went His way. It cost them their place and their nation. The judgment came through the Romans upon Jerusalem and upon the Jewish people

John 11:49-52

“And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; And not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.”

An unbeliever here makes a completely inspired statement. Caiaphas was speaking about the Jewish people. The Sanhedrin was the head of the Jewish people. But Jesus would not die only for the Jewish people. He would also gather together in one the children of God. It is therefore about all twelve tribes of Israel. Here it is not typology at all, but perfectly plain language. “Gather together in one” is also the expression from Ezekiel 37. The Lord would die not only for the two tribes, but also for the ten tribes, for the promise had been made to all twelve.

John 11:53

“Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death.”

That is exactly what Solomon did with regard to Jeroboam when he heard that the kingdom would be given to Jeroboam. Or: Judah would be provoked to jealousy by another people that was “Lo-ammi”.

John 11:54

“Jesus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews; but went thence unto a country near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with his disciples.”

When He no longer walks openly among the Jews, He walks in secret among Ephraim. That is exactly what it says. No one knows where the city of Ephraim lay, so why is it mentioned? Because it is a prophecy. For when the Jews officially rejected Him and tried to kill Him, salvation – the Saviour – would go from Judah to Ephraim. Judah’s house would be left desolate and another would take his office of overseer. Joseph was an overseer from Israel. (In the New Testament “overseer” is synonymous with shepherd, elder and leader.) He was the one who, outside Israel in Egypt, came to the highest power, who brought forth bread and kept the whole world alive. He was rightly the overseer who watched over the flock. That is what he said when his brothers came to him. He said that God had arranged it so as to preserve them a remnant in the land. That is also literally what Peter and John preached after Pentecost. Because Jesus was crucified, the counsel of God was fulfilled. In this way God brought about deliverance and established a remnant for Himself. It is all exactly the same as what Joseph said. Thus the statements about Joseph are in the end statements about Christ.

Here in John 11 it is therefore about the kingdom that would not be revealed but would remain hidden. If no revealed kingdom comes into being under Judah, then there will be a hidden priesthood under Joseph. That is the line of thought. That is also why Joseph in Egypt actually fulfilled a priestly function. In the same way a Joseph, who was the first one present at the resurrection of Christ, immediately ended up with Ephraim in Britain, without being able to do anything about it himself. In the same way Lazarus is very clearly a type of the High Priest of the New Covenant, just like Eleazar and ultimately Melchizedek. Lazarus also arrived in Britain on that same occasion. He later disappears again and returns to Gaul, where for many years he was a leader in the church at Marseille.

I wanted to make it clear that the two that would become one, as described in Ezekiel 37, are to be found in the New Testament in the Church. In this, Judah does not come first, but Ephraim.¹⁸ Hosea 14 In Hosea there is a statement about Ephraim that is applied in the New Testament to the Church.

Hosea 14:1-3

“O Israel, return unto the LORD thy God; for thou hast fallen by thine iniquity.

Take with you words, and turn to the LORD: say unto him, Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously: so will we render the calves of our lips.”

Here it is said to Israel, the ten tribes, that they must return to the LORD their God. They must ask the LORD to take away all iniquity. Those are the words they must take with them. And that He would give what is good. Then the ten tribes will “render the calves of their lips”. Literally “calves” means young bulls, but figuratively it is of course about offerings. The interesting thing is that this statement is expressly used in Hebrews 13. There it speaks in general about the priesthood of the believer in our days. Christ is the High Priest of the New Covenant. Believers have a part in Him. They are therefore also priests after the order of Melchizedek. We should bring offerings, and that is “the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name”. That is a statement from Hosea 14, and its use in Hebrews 13 refers to the Church in our days. Nevertheless it was a statement about Ephraim. We are a royal priesthood, with the emphasis on priesthood and on offerings. In the first place this means that with our lips we confess the name of Christ.¹⁹ Other Scripture Passages

Matthew 1:1

“The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.”

There you have the covenants of promise to Abraham and David. Jesus Christ is the Fulfiller of them. Then comes a splendid genealogy. The line begins with Abraham, through David. First fourteen generations from Abraham to David. Then fourteen generations from David to Jechonias. It is a list of heirs to the throne. The list ends with Jechonias, at the Babylonian captivity. He was king for eighteen years and three months and is cursed. The line begins with David, through Solomon to Rehoboam and eventually ends with Jechonias, who dies childless and so the line dies out. After the captivity an heir still has to be appointed. From the line of Solomon there was no one left. Jechonias was the last and he was carried away to Babylon. There, after three days, he was restored to honour and is a type of the Lord Jesus – death, resurrection and exaltation.

So someone else was appointed. Solomon had another brother: Nathan. Although he never inherited the throne, after the death of Jechonias the throne came to the

descendants of Nathan, to Salathiel. A jump is therefore made from one line to the other. The one line that runs through Solomon to Jechonias – typologically the line of Judah – breaks off. The genealogies of Judah no longer exist. There is no one who can still assert his rights to the throne of Judah. When the line of Judah (the two tribes) comes to a dead end, it automatically jumps to the ten tribes. It is simply a matter of inheritance law. In history the ten tribes may well have been the hated wife, for the LORD had two wives: a favoured one and a hated one, or a disadvantaged one. But what does the law say? The firstborn son of the hated wife shall indeed inherit. Why is that in the law? Because it applies to the ten tribes. That was the hated wife who was carried away into captivity. But she is nevertheless the heir. Hence the jump from Solomon to Nathan. That jump in the genealogy is the same jump as from Judah to Joseph.

Right at the end of the genealogy in Matthew 1 it says:

Matthew 1:15-16

“And Eliud begat Eleazar; and Eleazar begat Matthan; and Matthan begat Jacob; And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.”

“Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.” Why is Mary mentioned here? It is not necessary at all, for if Joseph is the son of Jacob, he is simply the heir to the throne. And if Jesus is the legal son of Joseph, as is also stated in Luke, then after Joseph of Nazareth, Jesus of Nazareth is the heir to the throne. When one lays the genealogy in Matthew alongside that in Luke, it is clear enough why Mary is mentioned here. Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, but Mary is the bodily daughter of this Jacob. By Mary marrying Joseph, Joseph became the throne claimant and the legal heir of this Jacob. The natural line of descent therefore does not go from Jacob to Joseph, but from Jacob to Mary. Matthew is therefore the register of Mary and Luke the register of Joseph. The Bible teaches that the throne is inherited through the woman, but that the woman herself may not sit on the throne. Mary was the heir to the throne, but because she might not sit on it, the throne was given on the ground of her marriage to Joseph to him – and possibly immediately to her Son, the Lord Jesus.

Types

Both Joseph and Mary are types of the ten tribes of Israel. In the one case the ten tribes are seen as the wife of Jehovah, and in the other case when it concerns the birthright and dominion. The jump is made from Mary to Joseph. With Joseph things are always hidden and foreign. That is the continuation of the story, for Joseph dreams. He noticed that Mary was with child and did not want to make her a public example, but wanted to put her away privily. He then disappears to Egypt. In Matthew the only ones who come to the Lord are the wise men from the east. They came to Jerusalem, but that was not where they were meant to be. They had to be outside the camp. They worshipped the Lord and by a dream they departed again by another way than the one they had come from. That is a beautiful picture of Israel that itself came out of captivity from that east. It came to the land, met the Lord there and came to worship, but immediately disappeared again from that land to return to captivity. That is the position of the Church in our days.

The Lost Son

The one who never left home is a picture of the Jewish people, of the Pharisees and scribes and those who lived under the law. That is stated in the passage. Who then is the son who went away, who alienated himself from the commonwealth of Israel, who in effect squandered his inheritance and yet returned with the announcement that he comes as a hired servant? But he is received as a son. Of course this speaks of the calling of the Church in our days, but that is a simplification of the story. In reality it is not about the Church but about the ten tribes of Israel who walked away from the Lord. Upon them came calamity and the curse, but out of that curse they nevertheless come to acceptance of the Lord Jesus Christ. The man who returns is indeed a picture of the Church, but only insofar as the Church descends from the ten tribes of Israel.

Two sons in the vineyard

They were told to go and work. One says, "I will do whatever the lord has said." That is what those who live under the law say. They will at least try, out of gratitude. That is a picture of the Jewish people. They said they would do it, but they did not. The other son says, "I will not." Yet he did it. That is the ten tribes. They never served the LORD under the Old Covenant. They disappeared, but in the end they did it.

Husbandmen who would not deliver the fruit of the vineyard to the lord of the vineyard. The lord said, "Then I will send my son." They said, "This is the heir; let us kill him." They wanted to kill him so that they would have the inheritance. That is what Caiaphas said to the Sanhedrin: "If we kill Him, we keep our position, our people, our city, and remain in charge." Then the Lord asked His contemporaries what should be done with those husbandmen. They answered that he should destroy those wicked men miserably – in captivity, in other words. The vineyard he should then give to another people who would bring forth its fruits. To which people? Not to the Church, for that is not the case. The New Covenant was not given to the Church, for the Church is the result of the offer and acceptance by those to whom the New Covenant was presented. The gospel was not preached to other nations in general, but to another people: the ten tribes of Israel. The Lord had to go from Judea through Samaria into Galilee. He then came to Shechem, to the piece of land where Joseph was buried – the land that Joseph had received from Jacob. As a whole it is a picture of the inheritance and the promises to Joseph. At Shechem sat that woman, and Jesus asked her for a drink. She thought that strange, for He is a Jew. Jews have no dealings with Samaritans. Yet Jews and Samaritans would become one. The Samaritans are, at least figuratively, regarded as the ten tribes of Israel, of which Samaria was the capital. The point is that it is established there that salvation is indeed of the Jews, but that the Jews reject that salvation. The Lord has left Judea and is in Samaria and therefore actually with the ten tribes. That woman immediately comes to faith in the Lord Jesus as the Messiah of the Samaritans and not of the Jews. The Lord does not answer to the Messianic expectations of the Jews. He was not the One they expected. But He does answer to the expectations of the Samaritans.

How is it that the gospel found such ready entrance among the Anglo-Saxon or Celtic peoples? The gospel answered to the expectations of these peoples. They were waiting for the coming of the Messiah who had been announced by the one true God. They were monotheistic peoples. He was the fulfilment of the old Celtic wisdom and their future hope. This woman in Samaria also immediately saw in the Lord Jesus the Messiah. He

fitted exactly their expectations. In this way the inhabitants of Shechem yet received a share in the blessings of Jacob. They had wanted that already in Genesis 38. There they were also circumcised, but they died. Here we find the same story, but in a different way. Dinah is here the Samaritan woman. The Lord Jesus is in John 4 the Messiah of the Samaritans.

The son of the nobleman

He was healed at a distance. That son stood completely outside. The father came to the Lord to tell Him that his son was sick, and the Lord healed him from a distance. That it concerns Israel is clear. But why at a distance? Because it is not about the Jewish people, for they were near. It concerns that part of Israel that was far off – alienated from the commonwealth of Israel. That son of the nobleman (the word “man” is not there) is the son of Joseph, the heir. He is healed at a distance. Afterwards it appears that the gospel, within a very short time – as soon as the persecution of Christians broke out in Jerusalem – went to the ten tribes of Israel. Officially rejected by the Sanhedrin and officially accepted by Ephraim.

The good Samaritan

While the priest and the Levite cannot help, the Samaritan (the Lord) does help. The priest and the Levite represent the Judaistic system. The Samaritan represents Joseph. He can help. It has always been so.

Ten lepers came to the Lord and were healed. They had to show themselves to the priest according to the law. When they returned it turned out that only one came back, and he was a Samaritan. That seems to me perfectly clear. Ten, but on closer inspection only one, and he a Samaritan. That is a picture of the ten tribes.

Ten apostles in the upper room. Paul and Silas meet Jews in Philippi. They came together on the river bank and not in the synagogue. There was no synagogue for the simple reason that Jews cannot have a synagogue if there are not “ten” – ten men. If there are fewer, they meet on the river bank, at running water or by the sea. When the ten are not there, there is no synagogue. There is then no kingdom, no gathering. The ten are lost. The story of Paul at Philippi expresses that the ten are lost.

Saul and Silas – two names that are essentially the same, the double portion therefore – are thrown into prison and immediately promoted to head of the prison. That is of course how it should be, for that also happened with Joseph. The prison is shaken to its foundations and everyone is free. Paul takes the lead and everyone simply stays in the prison. That is a picture of how the gospel goes to those who are in captivity, in prison. It does indeed shake those peoples to their foundations, for much changes. Yet the result is that everyone remains where he is. They know who they are and know their calling. They know that they should really be in Palestine, but they remain in captivity. The prison, however, has been opened.

Figuratively I could go on with this kind of argument. The point is that it figuratively means that God has in a special (mysterious) way ensured that the message would reach the ten tribes. Further, I can only note that among the ten tribes a far greater majority came to faith than among the two tribes, who officially rejected the gospel. Nevertheless the gospel is preached to all nations everywhere, in accordance with the will of God, so that everyone might have the opportunity to come to faith and to acceptance of the Messiah of Israel, the Messiah of the Jews, the Firstborn of a new

creation. From some peoples relatively few come to faith, from others many. This course of events is indeed part of God's plan. It was foretold in advance. The wonderful thing is that God's promises are fulfilled without it being obvious that this was a predetermined matter. Without the majority of Christendom even noticing any of it, what God had said has come to pass.

The New Covenant would indeed break in, but not in the first place with those to whom it was first proclaimed, namely the Jews, but with the other part of the people of Israel, of whom most thought that it had been definitively judged and lost.

Amen.